

DUE DATE SLIP**GOVT. COLLEGE, LIBRARY**

KOTA (Raj.)

Students can retain library books only for two weeks at the most.

BORROWER'S No.	DUE DTATE	SIGNATURE

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO
CIVICS AND POLITICS
(General Principles)

BY
SHRIKRISHNA VENKATESH PUNTAMBEKAR,
M.A. (Oxon.), Barrister-at-Law,
*Professor of History and Politics, Head of the History
Department, Benares Hindu University.*

ALLAHABAD
THE INDIAN PRESS, LTD.

1930

Printed and published by
K. Mitra, at The Indian Press, Ltd.,
Allahabad.

DEDICATED

TO

Manu and Kautilya the Pioneers of Social
and Political Sciences in India.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
Introduction	1—III
Chapter I. Hindu Social Theory ✕	1—16
“ II Social Life ✕	17—22
“ III. Civics and Social Sciences ✕	23—36
“ IV. Civics ✕	37—41
“ V Society and State ✕	42—60
“ VI. Government ✓	61—78
“ VII Government and Politics ✕	79—94
“ VIII Democracy and its Problems ✕	95—104
“ IX. The Organisation of Democracy ✓	105—122
“ X The Organisation of Public Opinion ✓	123—135
“ XI What is Good Life ✓	136—144
“ XII Patriotism and Humanity ✓	145—150

INTRODUCTION

Civics is generally considered as a science as well as an art of good social life. All other sciences social and physical, are expected to place their results at the service of man and the society of which he is a member and Civica is really a study of man as he is in relation to his social and physical environment. It does not however restrict its scope to find out what man is or what his relation to his environment is. It goes further and assumes the work of finding out what man ought to be and can be in relation to his surroundings, human or geographical. Therefore in studying this science the necessity of knowing the original and habitual nature of man assumes a great importance. Accepting as a fundamental proposition the fact that man is a conditioned but changeable being, as is proved by his past career and his present state, it becomes necessary to study the influences which limit his freedom or association, isolation or exclusiveness, and the forces which help his progress or aspirations.

Hence other important items in the study of Civics are the questions of the rise of society, of the traditions and forms it creates to regulate man who is found to be essentially a social animal, and of the ideals or the work it undertakes in order to provide scope for man's energies. All this may be called the social environment—the creation of man himself acting in groups or associations.

Then comes the study of the natural or geographical environment. It makes us realise how far man is a free being, how far the external influences limit the potentialities of his career or the manifestations of his personality, and how far he influences the environment. Civics also deals with other problems, such as men's duties in a particular environment and

the methods of their performance, the forms and institutions which will lead him into a harmonious relation with his recreated or perfected surroundings.

A preparatory knowledge about one's duty as a citizen or a patriot or a cosmopolite requires a thorough knowledge of the past history, of the present institutions and beliefs, and a survey of geographical features and influences whether untouched by the hand of man or recreated by him.

If the idea of Civics as it is conceived to-day is to restrict its scope to nations, then it becomes an intensive study of a particular culture, its present condition and its future work, and consequently racial forms and thoughts, grooves and tendencies, receive more attention than larger human values or virtues. The science of Civics is to-day conceived and dealt with in the spirit of national and not in the spirit of cosmopolitan values.

We have just commenced its study in India from the Indian point of view. My desire is to perform this task in the following pages in an elementary way.

European writers approach the study of Civics with ideas borrowed from their own history or society and from the classical history and literature of Greece and Rome. These two have played a very large part in moulding the thoughts and beliefs, the customs and conventions of Europeans. In India we are the inheritors of a Vedic civilisation which moulded our life differently from that of the Europeans. Therefore in our study of Civics and Politics it is essential to note first the general features of our social and political thought in order to be able to appreciate fully the various social and political factors which are influencing our life to-day.

In a study of this kind we find hardly any books which try to point out the individual mentality and social theories which an Indian student brings to bear on the problems of Civics and Politics. His mental outlook and civic endeavours are moulded largely by his social and religious traditions which are based on his social theories and religious convictions when

he comes in contact with new ideas which lead him to new values of life and conceptions of the future

Therefore it has become very necessary to state the general social theory of the Hindus in the very beginning of this book in order to help the student in valuing the old and the new conceptions of civic and political life

There is another aspect from which this treatment of the Hindu social theory is also important. To day every belief, every institution and every science are examined in the light of the idea of Progress. This idea was absent in the early speculations of the East as well as the West. The Rta-idea of cosmic order, the Yuga idea of successive deterioration and cycles of the Hindus, the idea of degeneration and decay or periods of cycles of the Greeks and Romans the idea of Predestination and Providential Design of the Mediaeval thinkers had moulded the outlook and confined the efforts of the peoples in pre modern history. Even their theories of freedom, individual and social, worked under these limitations of individual and worldly conceptions. Hindus and Moslems have not as yet given up this outlook on the course of human life. Hence it has become necessary to examine the various factors and beliefs of the traditional outlook and to state the strength they bring to bear on the problems of their civil life in all its phases and aspects.

Thus such a preliminary statement of the Hindu Social Theory will serve two purposes. Firstly it will give a correct idea of the traditional mentality and theory of the Hindus about social and civic life and ideals. Secondly it will serve as a study in contrast of the two different outlooks which must coalesce in their conflict or merge one into the other in order to make a happy and harmonious life in the future possible.

AN INTRODUCTION TO CIVICS AND POLITICS

CHAPTER I

HINDU SOCIAL THEORY

THE aim of the Hindus has been to produce the best man •
morally and spiritually by a life of conscious, social and indivi-
dual experience and ends. They worked out
its aim and their social theory and social organisation by
its ideas adopting the following ideas and institutions,
namely, the four Varnas, the four Āśramas the four Puruṣārthas,
the four Yugas, the three Lokas, the ideas of Karma and
Punarjanma, the three Avasthās, the three Guṇas, the three
Dandas or controls as a check on Karma, and the Eternity
and Universality of the Ātmā or Puruṣa and the finite Prakṛti
or matter

Under these conceptions they organised the life here and
hereafter, and in the light of its necessities, rules and regu-
lations, discipline and deterrents were laid
its contents down. Here we find stated by them some
fundamental views and practices about man as an individual
and man in association, as regards the reality in him, his
nature, his action and its results, the various stages of his
life, the classification of man according to his svabhāva or
nature, his various aims, his disciplines and their results, his
relation to time and creation, his final position in the Universe
and his ultimate end

These are some of the ideas and institutions round which the Hindu social theory works and on which it rests. Hindus, though they dealt with and kept before their eyes the Eternal in religion, the Universal in philosophy and the Formless in æsthetics, always believed in a life of experience and realisation in this world (Pratyakṣa Anubhava). The ideal or the reality, the absolute or the infinite, was to be approached through the practical or the actual, the relative or the finite. It was to be a progress by stages, a training and discipline through experiences. This world was considered to be unreal to the extent that it was not the end of existence, as it was full of changing forms and temporary beliefs. But otherwise it was the only actuality where a Mumukṣu (one desirous of salvation) could gain experience for reaching the ultimate reality (Tattva) and liberation (Mukti), or peace (Śānti) and joy (Ānanda).

Therefore this world and its life were not neglected, but all life's aspects, periods, and functions were mapped out, studied and organised, and their interrelation to the highest end of man properly laid down. The character of social organisation. The Hindus subordinated in their ultimate synthesis of the whole life of man the various aspects of that life to the central aim of human existence. The underlying principle of Hindu civilisation is therefore the balancing of ideals, purposes and functions, and their proper interrelation and subordination. Every svabhāva, every stage of man's life, and every aim of man's being personal and social, have been conceived as interrelated to others. Every one of these is to be expressed, led, and practised along with and in proper relation to others. Each followed independently or dominantly leads to partial or selfish life or perverted life, not to full or social life or normal life. Therefore each must be properly balanced or adjusted with the other and subordinated to the higher.

Hence it will be seen that each individual is allotted a task

and a time to do it. Each stage of his life is shown its own trials and tempers. The Varna theory, the Āśrama theory and the Puruṣārtha theory are rooted in the idea of division of work and allotment of functions according to Guṇa and Karma to different individuals, prescribing stages of work and laying down the ends which are to be sought after. The guiding conception is, however, of a virtuous but a harmonious and full life here and of a spiritual life hereafter.

Every individual is expected to go through all the aspects and trials or enjoyments of life and thus acquire experience during his forward journey of attachment (Pravṛttimārga) into this world (Saṃsāra) so as to lead him back on his returning-journey of detachment (Nivṛttimārga) to liberation (Mokṣa) without any further attachments to perishable objects or purposes.

Hindu social theory contemplates therefore the organisation of life in all its ways, stages, and ends. It believes in

the organisation of every moment and movement of a man's life for a higher ideal or purpose. Its object is to base itself on the experience of this world and its proper valuation. It does not create a conflict of loyalties or ideals, but asks us to choose our field of work and our piece of work, and follow it, and always wants us to keep in mind its interrelation to other and higher sides of life, and not allow our Svabhāva, Guṇa or Karma to dominate or to demoralise the rest. We are one amongst the many and are for the many in this worldly life which is chiefly a life of association and experience.

Further, each svabhāva, each stage, and each end of life has its rules, and systems and subjects of education or discipline, called Ācāra, Vyavahāra, and Prāyaścitta. These are all included in Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa Śāstras. Thus we find here laid down the courses of life of a good Brahmacārī, Gṛhastha, Vānaprastha and Sanyāsī, of a good Brāhmaṇa, Kṣātrīya, Vaiśya and Śūdra; and of an ideal Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa, we also find the Sāmānya-

dharma of all prescribed, as well as their Āpaddharma, Guṇadharmā and Svabhāvadharma. Then the life of Duryōta or one who is an apostate from his proper place and function of life is indicated, and the evils and dangers of an improper life pointed out.

Two Śāstras worked out the Hindu social theory. The Mokṣasāstra discussed and defined the end and place of man in Universe. According to the Vaiśeṣikas

The two Śāstras. that end was Niḥśreyasa or spiritual peace which was the result of man's deliverance from his attachments and limitations (Bandhanas). The Nītiśāstra looked to worldly life and welfare and led man through it, by laying down rules and advocating an organisation towards the ultimate end. Man is conceived to be able to rise higher by his satisfactions and disciplines secured in worldly attachments or limitations. These are expected to lead to the awakening of a pure passionlessness and of a spirit of harmony within him.

The Nītiśāstra consists of Dharma, Artha, and Kāma Śāstras. All the principles and rules laid down and followed

Their contents. for the moral and spiritual well-being of men are collected in Dharmaśāstra. These alone ensure security of welfare here and hereafter. In this the whole life of man is considered and tried

Dharmaśāstra. to be regulated and moulded. Ācāra, Vyāvahāra and Prāyaścitta are its main divisions. It consists of injunctions and prohibitions, that is, duties relating to:—

- (1) Domestic or family life.
- (2) Social life of men in each Varṇa and Āśrama, and their common life.
- (3) Religious life, organised in Yajña, Svādhyāya, Vrata and Tapas.
- (4) Political life of kings and subjects.

All the above items come under Ācāra section.

(5) Civil life organised in civil and criminal laws

It is the Vyavahāra section

(6) Purification or penances

It is the Prāyaścitta portion

These rules are not confused together but properly harmonised. They are meant for the same person in his different stages of life or spheres of work, and in his human relations and religious undertakings which are interrelated and interdependent. They are put together because the fundamental unity of human personality is not lost sight of. In Dharmaśāstra the higher conception of the ties, tasks, and transcendental values of society is tried to be worked out namely, how and why the society is ultimately to hold together (Dhāranā). Therefore it describes who a good Brāhmana is and gives rules and aims of his life and discipline, because Brāhmana is the best man morally and spiritually, and it is the aim of society to create or to develop such a best man out of every one.

Arthaśāstra dealt with Vārtā or the science of good Vṛtti or material life, and with Dandanūti or the science of good government wherein principles and rules of material welfare and political association were laid down. It consists of legitimate political institutions and rules which are necessary to protect Dharma conceptions, practices and society of men as such, and of the legitimate means and professions which secure livelihood or material welfare.

If in Dharmaśāstra the problem of the Vṛtti of the Brāhmana is fully dealt with, in Arthaśāstra the problems of the Vṛttis of Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas are properly indicated and worked out. In Arthaśāstra the higher conception of power and wealth and their legitimate acquisition, protection and promotion are discussed or stated, and the best Kṣatriya and the best Vaiśya are tried to be painted, by giving all their needs and the proper methods of their work and welfare.

Kāmaśāstra dealt with conjugal happiness and domestic equipments and accomplishments, leading to the legitimate satisfaction and development of Pañca Kāmaśāstra. Jñānendriyas and Pañca Karmendriyas. It consists of rules and regulations relating to matters of wooing, marriage, matrimonial life, good progeny, and various accomplishments, literary, recreative and domestic, and of the means of acquiring and possessing that happiness legitimately and morally. In Kāmaśāstra the higher conception of conjugal life on its moral side and not as in Dharmaśāstra on its social or religious side is indicated. Hence the best husband or Bhartā and the best wife or Bhāryā are tried to be described.

These three sciences are known as Trivarga. They are mutually dependent or Anyonyāśrayi, but in cases of conflicts between the duties prescribed by these three Their mutual relations. on any occasion, the Dharma rules are more important and binding than the Artha and Kāma rules. The rule is that *Arthaśāstrāṭṭu balavat Dharmaśāstram*, i.e., Dharmaśāstra is more binding than the Arthaśāstra.

Thus the Hindu Śāstras or the Hindu social theory undertakes the task of creating an ideal man for the purposes for which he is meant, of showing him his proper sphere, and legitimate work and method, Their aim. and of valuing the purpose of each and subordinating it to the higher and the whole end.

Men thus pursuing Trivarga will secure an abundance of unmixed happiness in this and in the other world. None of these Trivargas should be pursued in such a way as likely to be injurious to the interest of the other two. *Anyonyānubandhaṃ trivargaṃ seveta, and eṣāṃ samavāye pūrvaḥ purvo gaṇīyān* (Kāma Sūtra).

A good Brāhmaṇa searched after knowledge, peace and purity, and used Vedābhyāsa, Yajña, Tapas, Vrata, and Vidyā for reaching these (cf. Manu, X. 80, XI. 235).

A good Kṣātriya strived after power and freedom and used the discipline enjoined for a Saptāṅga state

A good Vaiśya desired for wealth and used his knowledge of Kṛṣi, Gorakṣā, Vāṇija, Kusīda, and the security and order of society for its pursuit

A good Śūdra wished to serve and used his knowledge of Kalā or arts and handicrafts for the purpose

The result of this theory is that the Brāhmana comes to possess spiritual merit and is therefore creative in thought and is a teacher the Kṣātriya to hold political power and is therefore a protector of life liberty and property the Vaiśya to handle material wealth and is therefore a supplier of material resources of life and the Śūdra to pursue arts and handicrafts, and is therefore a servant Thus life's important functions are properly assigned and entrusted to different classes, so as to minimise conflict confusion and perversion amongst them

The Hindu social and religious conceptions and practices The treatises are dealt with in the following books —

The Śrauta Sūtras concern themselves with the following of the injunctions (*Vacanāt pravṛtti*, *Vacanānupṛtti*) of the Eternal Vedas especially the Yajñadharmā, which is Patalaukika or other worldly in its effects

The Dharma Sūtras deal with the various stages of social life, the *Ācāra* or personal practices and disciplines of a student, a householder, a forest dweller and an ascetic; and of a Brāhmana a Kṣātriya, a Vaiśya and a Śūdra, with the Vyavahāra of the King and his subjects, and of the subjects with one another, and with the penances for all the breaches of duties of life The last mainly lay down rules for purity, and control of body and mind in various periods of personal life and associated life Therefore Saṃnyāsa and Sadācāra are emphasised

The Grhya Sūtras mention the Saṃskāras or the sacred

rites of life and initiation at various periods of physiological changes in body and psychological changes in mind.

The Hindu social theory was worked out similarly in political and other institutions of the society.

Hindus organised their territorial affairs on a group basis. Territorial units with an identity of interests or with common historical traditions were recognised as centres

The territorial group and the King's position. of some independent and real life. The affairs of lower units were properly guarded against the encroachments of higher

units but were duly subordinated to the greater social interests of the higher groups. There was more of devolution and less of interference from the above. Only in cases of conflicts or joint interests of similar units the higher groups were expected to interfere or to bring about co-operation and co-ordination. The lowest unit was Kula, and then higher in order were Śreṇi, Jāti, Pūga, Gaṇa, Grāma, Pura, Jānapada and Rāṣṭra. The King was the final adjudicator of disputes and conflicting interests. He was not the supreme law-giver, nor the irresponsible leader, nor the fountain of justice, nor the one primary landowner. He was the national representative, and the guardian of the peace. He was bound by oath to Dharma and to people to govern well. But in this function also he was to observe the laws of the society and to carry out the interpretations or applications of these laws with the help of the guardians of society or the Council of the learned or the wise. He himself was bound by the laws. He had duties to observe and virtues to develop. Thus ultimately the Hindu conception led to a system of laws or constitution, called Dharma, at the top. In it the King and the various groups had their functions laid down, their jurisdictions stated and their interrelations defined. A gāthā quoted by Asaḥāya in his commentary on Nārada (I. 11) states :—

Grāme dṛstaḥ pure yāti pure dṛstastu rājani

Rājñā dṛstaḥ kuḍṛsto vā nāsti paunarbhavo vidhiḥ.

The chief duty of the King was the protection of his subjects, of their life, liberty, property and pursuits of happiness and their social institutions. Manu (VII. 3) states:—*Rakṣāṛthamasya sarvasya rājānam asyat prabhuh* "It therefore involved a search for wrongdoers and their punishment, that is, *Kaṇṭakaśodhanam* and *Duṣṭasyadaṇḍah*. He was to inquire into their acts or vyavahāras with the assistance of a body of learned men. Yājñavalkya (II. 1) lays down:—

*Vyavahārānṛpah paśyet vidvadbhir brāhmaṇaiḥ saha,
Dharmaśāstrānusāreṇa krodhalobhavivarjitah.*

"The King should with the help of learned Brāhmaṇas decide lawsuits in accordance with the dictates of Dharmaśāstra unruffled by anger and uninfluenced by greed."

The Dharmaśāstra to be administered is based on Śruti, Smṛti, Sadācāra, *Svasya ca priyamātmanah*, or *Samyak saṅkalpajah*, *kāmah*, and is subject to local or group usages which are not inconsistent with the Śāstras, namely, the customs of Kula, Jāti, Śreṇi, Pūga, Grāma, Pura and Deśa. The verdict of the learned was generally binding on the King or his appointed officer or judge.

Nārada (X. 2. 3) explicitly states that "the king must maintain the usages of the guilds and other corporations. Whatever be their laws, their (religious) duties, (the rules regarding) their attendance, and the (particular mode of) livelihood prescribed for them, that the King shall approve of."

Yājñavalkya (II. 192) contains:—

*Śreṇi-naigama-pūṣaṇḍi-gaṇānām apyayaṃ vidhiḥ,
Bhedaṃ caiṣāṇi nṛpo rakṣet pūrva-vṛttiṃ ca pūlayet.*

This shows that the King was to step in when discussions and differences arose between different groups and make each party conform to the existing rules and usages.

*Samūhānāṃ tu yo dharmastena dharmeṇa te sadā,
Prakuryuḥ sarvakāryāṇi svadharmeṣu ca vyavasthitāḥ.*

This is quoted in *Vivādaratnākara* (p. 180) and shows the legal status of groups and associations

King's power is indicated by *Mitrāmisa* as follows —

"Samūhāśaktau tasyo danḍo rājñā vidheyah"

Bṛhaspati (XVII 20) says —

*Mukhyah saha samūhānāp visamvādo yadū bhavet,
Tadā vicārayet rājā svadharme sthapyat ca tan*

"When a dispute arises between the chiefs and the societies the King shall decide it and shall bring them back to duties

Bṛhaspati (I 28 30) further states —

"Relatives, guilds assemblies (of co-inhabitants) and other persons duly appointed by the King, should decide lawsuits among men except causes concerning violent crimes (*Sāhasa*). When a cause has been (duly) investigated by (meetings of) kindred it should be decided after due deliberation by guilds, when it has not been (sufficiently) made out by such assemblies (it should be) by appointed (judges)." These groups, vocational and territorial had judicial and executive powers, and also some rule-making power for themselves

The village as a territorial unit in the political administration of the country had great autonomous powers in administrative, taxing and judicial matters. Kings had only the final appellate authority

There were officers of the King to represent him in villages to superintend, to watch the interests of the people and to collect King's taxes. Thus the Hindu political system was not a centralised or military administration

There were guilds of merchants and professionals which looked after the economic organisation and wants of society. The religious associations or *Sanghas* regulated the religious life and met the religious wants of the people. The *Āśramas* and *Vidyāpiṭhas* gave education to the people's children. The

remaining matters of common and general interests were looked after by village-assemblies and their committees. These were generally for watersupply, roads, agriculture, gardens, tanks, sanitation, etc.

Most of these functional and territorial associations had a corporate character which was legally recognised. That the

King rarely interfered in the affairs of territorial or vocational groups is very well brought out in the accepted maxims of foreign policy or conquest. The life and laws of the conquered people were hardly interfered with. Even the defeated kings were restored. They were only made to acknowledge suzerainty and to pay tribute to the conqueror. This shows that the King was not the maker of laws or the lord of the people. He had no right to disturb social laws and rights and privileges. He must respect the traditions, customs, institutions, and associations of the people over whom he happened to rule. His duty was to hold balance even, and to see to the discharge of its duty by each class or group according to its own laws.

The King was thus the co-ordinating and the controlling authority in the institutional organisation of the Hindus, and not a sharing or all-absorbing authority. Nārada (X, 1, 2) says:—

King's controlling, co-ordinating and corrective power.

*Pāṣaṇḍi-naigama-śreṇi-pūgavrāta-gaṇādiṣu,
Saṃrakṣet samayaṃ rājā durge jānapade tathā.*

In one of its main aspects caste or Varna system was organised to give group interests and life an organisation and a stability. These interests might be industrial, political, religious, tribal, of race, language and custom, or educational. In this way best sides of those aspects of life could be specialised, developed and done well. Indiscriminate competition would not arise, and finally they would be co-ordinated into a whole according to their social importance in a system of grades or stages.

This functional idea runs through the whole Hindu Social Theory and organisation and can be studied well in the social, political, religious, educational and economic institutions and beliefs of the people. This theory and system was accepted very early in our history and there have always been attempts to approach it by the people as a whole.

Vedānta philosophy deals with the origin and nature of the world (Jagat), man (Jiva) and God (Ātman or Brahman). It does not deal with society or its progress but with each soul and its forward pursuit in worldly life and its return journey to a life of peace contemplation and ultimate union

Relation of *Vedānta* to Social Theory
 but with each soul and its forward pursuit in worldly life and its return journey to a life of peace contemplation and ultimate union or absorption in the great soul. It also deals with the nature of man and his end. Hindu Social Theory, however, does not deal with the origins and nature of society, class, caste or state, nor does it give their historical development, but deals with their organisation in four Varnas and four Āśramas and four functions or Purusārthas. The origin of caste and state as given by the Vedas, Manus or Mahābhārata are mere statements of what the people believed and not what people rationally and historically found it out to be.

Society is taken by Hindus to be something like an organism not like a mere mechanism. But each man is considered ultimately independent to lead his own future in the social environment in which he is placed by experiencing it and by withdrawing himself ultimately out of it.

The nature of Hindu Social Theory
 Hindu social theory contemplates a law of life for the whole of the Universe and realises the place of man in it and regulates the stages and functions of his life and aims accordingly. Man is not considered an independent or insubordinate unit, but has a recognised part in the same. He is, no doubt, partial in manifestation but can become universal in liberation. But he has to go through a process before he can pass from his primitive stage to that of perfection. This process is influenced

This earth is man's world or field of action, desire and experience. As a result of his good Karma he goes to a higher world of enjoyment and as a result of his bad

The three Lokas or worlds Karma he falls into a lower world of suffering. All these three worlds are not permanent places of his abode. He goes to them to work out the results of his good or bad action or for the satisfaction of his desires or cravings. This is a cycle of births and deaths and is not transcended till he reaches the stage of desirelessness, and then the results of his Karma do not become attached to him, and he becomes free or is liberated.

Karma is the law of life. As you sow so you reap. Man is free to act but he has to enjoy or suffer the results of his good or bad actions or efforts. He cannot escape them. But if his past Karma regulates or binds him, his present Karma creates for him the conditions of his future life. He escapes from the results of it if he does it without attachment to or desire for its fruits.

Man does not end his existence in one life. It is a series of lives that he goes through, enjoying or suffering the results of his Karma and acquiring new experiences, punishment and enlightenment till his desires or cravings subside and he realises the unity of his soul with the great soul of the Universe, and his partial or selfish nature becomes the universal or *sātvika* or pure nature.

Every organism and therefore human body also passes through the stages of origin (*Utpatti*), growth (*Stithi*), and decay (*Laya*). The inner soul has to throw off this

It is like a covering of the body and assume a new one in order to satisfy his desires or to accumulate his experiences. Body is matter and like all matter is prone to growth and decay.

Hence a new birth and a new life are necessary to the aspiring and developing soul which is immortal and would be universal.

The soul of man is endowed with different qualities. Its highest nature is called Sāttvika, its lowest nature is Tāmasika, and its middle nature is Rājasika. The Tāmasika stage is that of ignorance or darkness, laziness or inactivity. It results in vulgarity, indolence, and wickedness. The Rājasika stage is that of spirit or passion, desire or activity. It results in ambition, greediness and desires. The Sāttvika stage is that of purity or non-attachment, faith or tranquillity. It results in liberation and peace. Man progresses from one to the other till he escapes from the attachments to the world born of ignorance or desire, and reaches the state of serenity, self-restraint, purity and knowledge.

Karma or action will be good if it can be controlled. Mind, speech and body are to be properly controlled and disciplined in order that Karma may be proper or without attachment. These controls are known as Manodanḍa, Vākdanḍa and Kāyadanḍa or disciplines for the mind, speech and body which will check their aberrations and will set them on the path of right action and desire. The Vicāra of the mind, the Uccāra of the tongue, and the Ācāra, Āhāra and Vihāra of the body should be Sat or good, Sāttvika or pure, and Samyak or right. This discipline alone will lead to the moral and spiritual development of the soul or the best man. These are the conditions and limitations under which a man grows and acts. These disciplines and ends alone lead him to the final goal or reality.

CHAPTER II

SOCIAL LIFE

BEING AND WELL BEING

AMONGST the civilised races of mankind the Aryans are in the van of progress. Their history and culture are very old and the best developed. They seem to possess a philosophy of a vigorous, virtuous and active life, and a mind open to fresh and high influences. Of these Aryans the Indo-Aryans form a great branch, possessing a continuous history for the last 7,000 years from the times of the Vedas. Their values and ideals of life have held a very high place in the world's views and practices of life. They have tried to lay down and to follow principles and ends of good life for man and society. They have co-ordinated and systematised life here and hereafter, adjusting, balancing and subordinating lower ends to the higher and the highest end. They have examined all sides of life, its various practices and necessities. The great aim of their philosophy or science of life has been to prepare man for a good personal, social and spiritual life, and thus to lead him to his final perfection and liberation. Their philosophy and their methods and practices are unique in the history of man's endeavours towards individual and social perfection.

The problem before every thinking individual to day is how to lead a good life and a full life as a social being and in moments of personal isolation. The long experience of the Hindus ought to help us in leading well our lives to day. Human life as lived is an imperfection, a struggle and a suffering.

[It is the desire of every one that it should not remain so, but that the attendant struggle and suffering should lead to real happiness and to material, moral and spiritual

(non-violence), *Sunṛta* (truth) *Asteya* (non-stealing) *Brahmacarya* (chastity), and *Apangraha* (non-greediness or renunciation or sacrifice), contemplate the same end. The *Pañcasīla* of the Buddhists namely, avoiding *Prānāghāta*, *Adattādāna* *Vyabhicāra*, *Asatya* and *Surāpāna* have the same aim in view. These rules relate to non injury to life, property and honour of women sanctity of word and to self sacrifice or non-greediness. They are the elementary rights which relate to a person's life, liberty, property and pursuit of happiness.

† Therefore society being natural and necessary the quality and virtues which helped in the formation, preservation and promotion of a well ordered and well-regulated society were necessary to be searched for.

The virtues necessary for a good social life. The Hindu *Dharmaśāstra*lāras based their suggestions on their wide observations and past experience and laid down that the existence and continuation of a good society is possible if the tenfold virtues were observed. *Sauca* (purity) *Akrodha* (want of anger), *Guru-śusruṣā* (service of great men), *Āhāra-lāghava* (moderation in eating), *Apramāda* (want of carelessness), *Ahimsā* (non-violence), *Satya* (truth), *Asteya* (non-stealing), *Brahmacarya* or *Avyabhicāra* (chastity), and *Aparigraha* (non-greediness or renunciation or sacrifice). These are known—the first five as *Niyamas* and the other five as *Yamas*. The presence of these qualities in the individuals of a society in the purest form makes that society the best qualified for a fuller and a higher individual and social life. The *Brāhmaṇa* class was expected to possess them in their purest form and did to a large extent possess them, and therefore it was considered superior to the other classes and of great value in the economy, happiness and purity of society. The *Kṣattriyas* could not take to *Ahimsā* and to *Aparigraha*. The *Vaiśyas* could not fully practise *Satya* and *Asteya* as well as *Ahimsā* and *Aparigraha*. The *Sūdras* could not observe *Avyabhicāra* in addition to various other virtues, and the *Antyajas* could not observe any *Sauca* (purity) or virtue fully. Therefore one was consider-

ed lower to the other according to his ability to follow the various virtues. Even amongst the Brāhmaṇas the Sanyāsin alone could observe all these virtues at their best. The Yamas were more in the nature of mental restraints and disciplines for a good social life, and the Niyamas in the nature of bodily restraints and observations for a good personal life. To a best man all these ten virtues were essential.

Manu (X. 63) states the Sāmāsika Dharma or general social duties of all classes as Ahimsā, Satya, Asteya, Śauca and Indriyanigraha. These are social virtues and necessities for the very existence of any society.

Again the Daśalakṣaṇaka Dharma of Manu (VI. 92) emphasizes the following ten virtues in a man: Dhṛti (courage or satisfaction), Kṣamā (forgiveness), Dama (control), Asteya (non-stealing), Śauca (purity), Indriyanigraha (control of senses), Dhī (devotion or wisdom), Vidyā (knowledge), Satya (truth) and Akrodha (want of anger). The additional five become necessary for a civilised or virtuous society.

Bhagavadgītā gives the virtues of a best Brāhmaṇa (XVIII. 42) as Śama (serenity), Dama (self-restraint), Tapa (austerity), Śauca (purity), Kṣānti (forgiveness), Ārjava (uprightness), Jñāna (wisdom), Vijñāna (knowledge) and Āstikya (belief in God). These are personal virtues and not social. But ten Yamas as enumerated in Dharma Smṛtis are social virtues or qualities:

*Brahmacaryam dayā kṣāntir dānam satyam akalkatā,
Ahimsā 'steya mādhye damaśceti yamāḥ smṛtāḥ.*

(Chastity, mercy, forgiveness, charity, truth, sinlessness, non-violence, non-stealing, sweetness and control.)

Therefore the ideas of superiority and purity were determined according to this tenfold test. Varṇas, Jātis and Upajātis, Āśramas, and Puruṣārthas were classified accordingly. These virtues are mainly based on control and purity of mind, body and soul. These two alone, control and purity, were considered essential for the rise of higher virtues and curbing of lower passions, those of Kāma (desire), Krodha (anger).

Lobha (greed), Mada (pride), Moha (allurement) Mistrisya (envy), and then only a good social life was possible.

THE SOCIAL NATURE OF MAN

The social state of mind of an individual first arises from a sympathetic consciousness of the resemblance between the self and the not self just as a consciousness of their difference maintains the individual character of man. The apprehension by the self of its own image in the not self is the starting point of social sense.

Hindus state this fundamental social and spiritual truth in their Vedantic formula *Tatvamaso* thou art that or *So'ham* I am that. On the recognition of this depends according to them, the formulation of the truths of social sciences and the philosophy of ethics, metaphysics and psychology.

Thus fellow-feeling is the cause of social phenomena. Professor Giddings says that consciousness of kind distinguishes social from non social phenomena. (This fellow feeling between the ego and the alien results in and necessitates mutual aid or co operation). Without it social phenomena have no existence or value. It is this fellow feeling and fellow service which are at the root of what we call the civic idea. Man in the words of Aristotle is naturally a social or civic animal. Some kind of grouping or community is necessary for him to live a full life. The first step, therefore, towards a higher and better life, that is, an advance from a savage, narrow or isolated life toward a civilised life is the foundation of some sort of community. Hobbes describes pre-social life as "solitary, poor, nasty brutish and short". Higher civilised life indicates more inter relation, more inter-dependence, greater co operation, harmony and synthesis. (Amongst men it is not a living to themselves alone like animals, that is, natural or vicious, but it is a living

along with others for self as well as for others. Power of thought, discrimination, morality and speech help man in his advance over other animals. He maintains it only by its discriminating use for higher social and spiritual purposes. Man has not only something common and intimately bound with other men, but he has something common with and dependent on or inherited from God. Therefore not only all aspects of his social life are to be considered and valued, but his spiritual position and life has to be recognised and moulded. On their proper balancing and harmonising depends the success or realisation of all the ideals of good life.

CHAPTER III

CIVICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE aim of the Hindu civilisation is as we have stated, to develop the best man morally and spiritually. All the

personal social and spiritual disciplines and deterrents are meant to provide for the same. The aim of the Hindu civilisation

Society is not the end but is a necessity as a means for worldly experience. It is a present

reality and therefore man without it cannot live, nor can he live well. His being and well being primarily depend upon social life, and social aims and organisation. Therefore Civics is a science of social living.

The problem of Civics is a problem of neighbourhood or human association. How to live together, how to live the best life, how to live with other groups, all such

The problem of Civics questions fall within the province of Civics. Thus the great problem before men according to Civics, is how to live together happily and well.

Civilisation has progressed from a nomadic and hunting stage to an agricultural and industrial stage. Man has developed permanent social relations and

Social Sciences territorial groups. Consequently, the contact of man with man has been more constant, more wide and more intricate. These relations and groups in order to be harmonious and settled require a study of life in all its aspects and manifestations. This study will lead to the understanding of the principles of social organisation and of the roads to man's freedom. It will relate to his social acts and behaviours in the past, to his present state and methods of social organisation, and to his future aims and purposes in life. Social Sciences discuss and deal with these facts and ideas. There

was no doubt good living and some ideas of well-being before the study of Social Sciences arose. But these sciences are making the knowledge of society more systematic, comparative and useful. They not only study the past and collect accurate knowledge of various societies, their growth, aims and organisation, but also lay down useful hints for guidance in the future with the aim of making life good and happy. Man is essentially and naturally social. Social sciences treat man in his activities as a member of a group. It is man's conscious association with his fellows that develops his moral nature.

Sociology wants to study all about the development of social man viewed as a whole. It is the general science of

Sociology. social phenomena. It relates to his collective behaviour. But the term 'Sociology' is used by writers somewhat vaguely. It no doubt inquires into the origins of human groups, their various forms, laws, customs, institutions, languages, beliefs, ways of thinking, feeling and acting. Its province covers all knowledge about human life. In this sense it has to deal with Economics, Politics, Religion, Eugenics, Education and so forth.

Anthropology undertakes the general study of humanity of man as isolated, and of man in association, of man in evolution and of society in manifestation.

Anthropology. These two sides of study are sometimes described as Idiotology and Sociology. We are not concerned with man in isolation, but with man in association. We want to know Sociology, and the relation of Civics to the various branches of Social Sciences.

Science means a body of particular facts or of general truths, or of both facts and truths. It has some organised

Science. method of investigation relating to some limited circles of objects with a view to understanding and interpreting the facts and truths within that circle. Human life provides such a circle of objects from which important facts and truths may be observed and stated. Science generally involves a statement of facts which have

existed or now exist. Thus it is descriptive. It also classifies or compares them and notes their origin and growth. It thus discusses and compares the known, that is the past and the present. But it does not value them as good or bad. It only tries to find out similarities and differences in a group of kindred observed phenomena. It is concerned only with what is and does not introduce any judgments of value.

A Social Science deals with social facts and social truths and their inter relation and the tendencies observed in their origin, growth, structure and inter-relation.

In Philosophy facts may be studied with a view to comparing their ethical values. It deals not merely with the question whether such facts did or do exist but also with the question whether or not it was or is good that they should so exist. It enters into the unknown, into what ought to be. It tries to view and value particular acts and truths in relation to the whole within which they are included.

Social Philosophy tries to interpret the significance of the special aspects of human life with reference to the social unity of mankind. It tries mainly to study values, ends and ideals. It does not deal primarily with what exists, has existed or may be expected to exist, but rather with the meaning and worth of modes of existence. It however takes into account what is ascertained by particular social sciences. It is not its province to discover facts. It has to accept facts from other sciences and to try to interpret and value them.

Civics is a Social Science. It borrows its materials from the records of the past. History supplies it with pictures of societies or group, their organisation and aims, their successes and failures in their various social activities and outlooks. Without History a knowledge of these things would be impossible and the experience afforded, warnings and dangers

seen would go unheeded and unutilised. The beginnings of man's ideas of good life or full life are embedded in the past and the actual results of those ideas and the real facts of the life led or seen there. The study of Civics would both be rootless and fruitless unless the past history is studied and its lessons analysed and compared in order to find out the basic elements of a good life. Experience furnishes values for better understanding. History records how man acted in the past. But there is a limited value of historical knowledge and experience. Its information cannot be a correct guide for all ages and for all peoples under new circumstances, and in changed aspirations.

All the aspects of social life change and develop from age to age and have their characteristics determined and modified by many circumstances of time and place. These are all noted in History. History itself however shows that one set of ideals, a particular kind of organisation, and one method of activity have not suited to or been followed in all times.

Biology deals with various forms of life, its progress from one form to another and with its various manifestations and inter-relations during a long course of time on this earth. The conception of evolution on which it is based helps us to interpret the growth of early, simple and narrow forms of social life to later, complex and wider forms. Consequently we understand human life better in relation to its environment, and their mutual influence.

The Science of Eugenics is the study of the part played by inheritance in human affairs. When knowledge so gained is applied to improve racial qualities, it is called Applied Eugenics. Birth of a well-born child is also the aim of Civics. Hence Eugenics has a great place in civic studies as regards suitable marriages and progeny.

The special characteristic of man is the presence of mind in him. Psychology is the science of mind or of all mental phenomena including social conduct and its relation to relations. It is in short the study of human Psychology behaviour its laws and forces in isolation and association. Here not only the influence of reason but that of instincts emotions appetites and habits on the formation and activities of societies is considered. Its study helps us in understanding the motives and factors which mould life as well as good life.

The law of natural selection and the conception of life as a process of adjustment of an organism to its environment are the basis of Biology and a help to Psychology. With the help of these conceptions sociology attempts to account for the origin growth structure and activities of society as influenced by the operation of physical vital and psychical causes working together in a process of evolution. Civics utilises this social survey and knowledge.

Education implies that man is a perfectible being. It indicates a process by which the individual partly by his inner forces and partly by external guidance can be developed as a responsible member of a community, fulfilling definite functions in life and thus promoting good life. Education is its relation to the theory of Education gained both in unconscious and intentional ways by the influences of contact with surroundings and by self cultivation with the help of teachers. Thus an individual learns to expand and to limit himself for his own and common good.

Ethics examines the aims and ends of good life and values them as ideals for a good and virtuous life. Civics tries to lay down rules and methods of achieving those ideals so as to create a healthy and vigorous community. What is morality or good conduct, what is happiness or virtue, what is duty or good, right or wrong, these conceptions are examined in Ethics. If Ethics is philosophy, Civics is practice of good life.

Economics deals with the satisfaction of material wants of life ; with the laws of production, exchange and distribution of economic goods under the influence and conditions of physical and psychological forces. These forces depend upon the social ideas and institutions of good life as developed by a civically organised people. Without good material life higher moral or spiritual life is not possible. A good social or civic life implies a proper satisfaction of material needs of life.

Politics is a science of peace, order and good government. It deals with one aspect of life, the membership and organisation of a political body. It is a science of State, and an art of organisation of the principle of authority and obedience in the

form of institutions and constitutions. It tries to examine the fundamentals of State, its elements and origin, and to lay down its structure, functions, province and end. Its main function is to organise the protection and preservation of society from external danger and internal dissolution. Thus while Politics deals with State and Government, Civics deals with a citizen, his rights and duties, his aims and attitudes. It refers to the human and social side of a man's life, its environment, its diseases and weaknesses. The aim of the State is to maintain the external conditions of good life ; that of Civics, the actual rules of that life.

Jurisprudence is the science of law. Law ethically involves the ideas of justice and regulation. Legally it is a command of a sovereign. The question of justice and just rules are a matter more of Philosophy than of Science. Civics admits the validity of laws laid down for good life of the community. It reserves the right of resistance to bad laws which oppress the community without denying the duty of obedience to the legitimately constituted authority. If Jurisprudence emphasizes the legal aspect of order, Civics values order and progress, both in its legal sense and as a moral necessity.

The problem of Religion has been to put man in good relations with God. The problem of Civics is to put man in harmonious and loving relations generally with man but especially with his neighbours. It recognises the mutual contact and influence of man upon man and of environment upon man. Such reciprocal contact and influence is what is meant by life in society and environment.

Man has something of both a beast and a God. *Nicoccair bhāvam gatah* (endowed with high and low qualities) is the characteristic nature of man. He is said to be endowed with threefold *Gunas* or qualities.

Sattva, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. He manifests himself in *Dāvi* and *Āsuri* characters. He is a complex of both good and bad impulses and emotions. It is the aim of civilisation to lead him from the lower to the higher qualities and impulses from in-truth to truth, from darkness to light, from material life to spiritual life, from egoism to altruism.

We find that man is also equipped with qualities which imply social reference and with organs which imply social intercourse, for example, morality, reason, mind and speech. Their manifestations and activities are a good index to man's social nature and his inter relation to others.

Again we know that man is born in a family and belongs to a caste or community. He is at his birth in a particular locality or neighbourhood and owes allegiance to a particular country and this at a particular period in its local and national history.

Remembering these qualities and conditions of man we must try to understand whether man is born free and is self-sufficing, how far he depends on his parents, what he owes to his clan or caste, church or state, to what extent the influence of environment and physical nature and of social heritage and deals affects his mental equipment and personal freedom. Every social theorist admits man's limitedness and his particular equipment 'born of his upbringing and environment.' But what

he does not admit is that he is not free to institute changes in what he has received and to refashion himself and his surroundings into new and correct forms. The question is what is man's prime condition. Is it crude and imperfect, or is it good and great? We find man is born generally imperfect, ignorant, dependent and brutish. But at the same time we find him possessing a spirit which wants to make him good, great and perfect. This spirit contemplates the necessity of freedom for man so that he may throw off old shackles or legacies; and therefore we say that man is born free, that is, he is not divinely bound to what exists or what limits him. It is his inborn right or nature to make changes and to rise to higher states, material, moral and spiritual. He does not want to overthrow society but wants to create a better society and to assert his right to it. His right to rebel has to be recognised. Even most of the conditions under which he is born are of human make, and therefore they can have no charter of infallibility.

Rousseau does not deal with the actual institutions of existing states and the particular conditions in which man is found. He wants to lay down the essential

Rousseau's ideas of man and society.

principles which must form the basis of every legitimate society, and that part of the nature of man on which emphasis should be put or to which scope should be given. He tries to indicate the universal principles lying at the root of human combination and progress. He is in search of a society which does not curb man's real freedom and true aims.

A man may be weak in body at birth, may want nourishment, may be deficient in understanding, experience and

Man and society.

knowledge, but these facts are not unalterable and can be changed. Process of change in society is due to man's rebellion against what is unnatural or restrictive to him. He does not find society, as it exists, perfect. He finds it in a process of change. He knows that he is not living in the very first society

or community. He very well knows that there are different types of societies and that they have not originated in one way. In this change and variety of society the prime factor is man and hence man's freedom is what makes, maintains and un-makes different forms of societies. Man has to be recognised as both creative and possessive in spirit, emotional and rational, imitative and desirous of change.

The Science of Civics arose in cities. Plato in his Republic and Laws and Aristotle in his Politics, began a scientific observation and classification of social facts.

Civics is his and generalisations from a study of their life place of origin. In these works society as organised in the city or state is interpreted in its integrity. But they have neither separated Politics from Ethics and Civics, nor sciences from art. They however studied the complex life of cities in their ideals, organisation and elements in their origin, growth and decay and thus encouraged the science of Civics. Greeks contemplated men of the city or rather of Greek cities as advanced or civilised and others as slaves or barbarians and in their desire to maintain their political independence and moral and mental superiority as a race they developed a science of 'polis' or state for their guidance and greatness.

The term Civilisation is born of civic life. It originally meant the making of a human being a city man and giving him the mores or culture of a city. City was considered the home of perfect or highest culture, where man's life was fully manifested, where his powers and potentialities were fully evident, where his complex nature got full response and freedom. The city was considered the State which was in Aristotle's words the highest association for the realisation of the good of man. It provided full opportunities for an all-sided creative and virtuous life. Thus we see three ideas in city's life or civilisation. The first is that of a self-sufficing life. The second is that of an all-sided achievement and progress, and the third is that of a favourable environment and response.

* Some
terms
salion

Civic
Civil

This confinement of the idea of civilisation to city-life has undergone change in course of history, as we now find that a city is like a village only one unit or territorial group within a larger group like a country or even world. The idea of civilisation has extended itself to a country's larger life, or to the world's higher life. It means the manifested forms and habits of life, good as well as evil. It is to be learnt from the whole world. Its forces, habits and outlook may be different in different countries because of their different environment and ideals. We take an account of these at different times in their static conditions. We also note what ideals or forces cause changes in their manifestations, and thus record its dynamic aspects also. Thus civilisation is a picture of life in order and progress at various stages in history.

Culture implies more the inner life, good, true and beautiful, than the manifested forms and habits of good life. Originally the word referred to the cultivation of

Culture. land and meant what is cultivated or acquired

on the material plane, but now it suggests the moral or spiritual side of life. It may however mean :-

(1) Enjoyments and conveniences of body,

(2) Acquisitions of the soul as expressed in language, literature, religion, etc., and

(3) Social ideals, expressions and institutions.

The important thing to be noted is that people are considered to have a soul, whose quality and character takes different turns, and which expresses itself in various moulds and forms and in new spirit and changed ideals under different environments. People are considered not only to be made up of bodies or so much flesh to be nourished and governed by any system or regimen whatever, but to have a soul which is a pervasive power and a living principle creating something new, something bold and beautiful.

The attributes of a Citizen differ in every country or society. We may define him as one who is born in a particular country with one or more of the following common attributes or qualifications namely, belonging to one race or religion speaking the same language or possessing the same culture and obeying the same political authority. A citizen is primarily a member of a state. His other attributes may be based either on fact or fiction. He is entitled to all the benefits for which the state is organised and in return he owes it certain duties and obligations. Thus the idea in a citizen is mainly political namely the extent to which he possesses political rights and duties.

Aristotle defined a citizen to be one who has the power to take part in the deliberative or judicial work and administration of a state and the state, he considered, is a body of citizens sufficing for the purposes of life. A citizen is in short, one who rules and is ruled in turn and one who can hold a judicial or legislative office. His aim according to Aristotle is the salvation and safety of the community its being and well being. His virtue is to know how to govern like a freeman and how to obey like a freeman. Aristotle has considered citizen both in an absolute and a relative way. He tries to point out the best, the virtuous or the perfect citizen in general and also the best in relation to a particular constitution or government that is democracy, aristocracy and monarchy.

Aristotle's definition is mainly political and relative to state. But there are other aspects of and groups in society. Men have various associations and functions and state does not enter into their provinces. These are economic religious, social, literary or humanitarian.

Hindus' conception of the best or pure man, as expressed in Bhagavadgītā (XII 13), is as follows —

*Adveṣṭā sarvabhūtānāṃ mantrah kṛpā eva ca,
Nirvraṇṇa nirahankārah samaduhkhaśukhahṛgāmī*

(He who beareth no ill will to any being, who is friendly and compassionate, without attachment and balanced in pleasure and pain and forgiving)

*Muktasaṅgo anahaṃvādi dhṛtyutsāha samanvitaḥ
Siddhyasiddhyor nirvikāraḥ kartā sātत्वika ucyate.*

(Bh. Gītā, 18. 26.)

(Liberated from attachment, not egoistic, endowed with firmness and confidence, unchanged by success or failure, that actor is called pure.)

Hindu conception is more social, humanitarian and spiritual. It is based on the harmonising of ends or purposes of life and subordination of the lower ones to the higher. It is based on the ideas of Preyas and Śreyas, Abhyudaya and Niḥśreyasa, or Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. To them the law of life is a balancing of these ends and purposes or a balancing of Mamatva and Samatva. From this we may infer that a citizen is one who takes a definite part in all social activities and needs. That part is either of personal enjoyment or social service. He obeys the calls, fulfils the functions, preserves the interests and advances the aims of social life. He feels, thinks and acts for it on the principle of just dealing with all men.

The modern European idea of a good citizen is not merely that of one who is a member of state or obeys its laws, but one who has an active sense of being an integral part of the state. He is not a part of it because he lives within its boundaries or has accepted its ideas or become naturalised in it, but he is a part of it only in so far as he helps to make it and maintain it as a great civilised and civilising group.

Citizenship is the right ordering of our several loyalties, that is, it means the performing of our functions and duties in various walks of life by properly inter-relating their respective importance. The respective values of the purposes we aim at and the institutions we belong

to have to be balanced and adjusted. Then only the right ordering of loyalties can be indicated or undertaken.

Hindus did this in their ideals and institutions. Their four Puruṣārthas, their Varnas, and their four Āśramas were properly balanced, subordinated and harmonised. Then only a citizen knew what ideals and what institutions were to be obeyed or followed at what period of life or in time of conflicts of ideals, purposes and institutions. Hindus also laid down the following principle —

*Tyajeddeham kuḷasyārthe grāmasyārthe kuḷam tyajet,
Grāmam janapadasyārthe ātmārthe pṛthivīm tyajet*

(One should give up oneself for the sake of one's family, one's family for the sake of one's village, one's village for the sake of one's country and the world for the sake of one's soul.)

Here a proper inter relation and subordination of smaller groups to larger groups are laid down, and the Hindu ideal of Civics is stated. In case of conflicts of interests, the preferences and exclusions are laid down. Spiritual salvation of the soul is stated to be the highest preference. But in worldly affairs the lower and local interests are subordinated to higher and national or humanitarian interests. The material life is subordinated to the spiritual, the selfish and narrow to the humanitarian.

Herein lies the noble conception of Hindu civics. All the aspects of man's life are carefully considered. All his energies are given an opportunity and a period for expression and are put to good use in a disciplined scheme of life. Men are allowed to follow their passions but they are asked to purify them, educate them, discipline and direct them. Men's impulses are not considered wrong or wicked. They are not to be directed to wrong ends. The forces of life are to be used and not stifled. Man is considered not so much wicked, corrupt and dishonest, as deluded, ignorant, and indolent. The aim is to lead to wisdom, harmony and peace. This leads to a higher concep-

tion of citizenship. It is not so much a right or duty but an attitude and activity to be exercised at every moment of our life. Each man is to do his part or function fully and take his share in building the community and civilisation and himself on a higher plane. Citizen's aim is the creation of a higher and better life, and not the mere enjoyment of certain privileges or powers

This work of citizenship is best done in the neighbourhood where an opportunity for training activity and service is well afforded. A citizen will get full scope and stimulations for work. There will be found a definite objective for which one can use all his powers, passions and joy.

CHAPTER IV

CIVICS

CIVIS in Latin means a citizen. Civics is a science of citizens and a philosophy of citizenship. It is stated by some as a science of civilisation. Its meaning, Professor Patrick Geddes limits it to a study of cities and considers it as that branch of Sociology which deals with cities. One aspect of this definition is very important. Man's life is best and mainly lived in and for the city. He should make it the objective of his life's activities and work. But this definition does not bring out man's larger relationships and other duties and aspects of life. Still the love of place and service in the neighbourhood—the essential ideas in civic life—are correctly emphasized. Civics may be stated to be —

- (1) A study of what is really good life for oneself, one's society and country and
- (2) the practice of the knowledge gained in the best ways of life which are consonant with one's past culture and present needs and environment.

Civics is thus a science. It extends from local interests to national and human relations. Thus it has a moral aim, a practical programme of service and a continuous experience and training. Therefore it must consider all the aspects of life, individual and social, physical and moral at a particular time in relation with the past and with the future aims in view. Creation of a healthy community is its aim.

All other social sciences lead to Civics. They are in a way subsidiary to it. They find out correct knowledge and give their results in the nature of laws or principles for guidance and indicate the methods to be followed in this great science of life. Civics harmonises and uses all the results arrived at

by the different social sciences. It gives them a trial and sees if they are justified when applied to man's life as a whole in a definite way and in a definite place. If this conception of Civics is accepted, it approaches the Hindu conception of *Nītiśāstra* or even *Dharmaśāstra*.

Nītiśāstra is the science which deals with the norms or mores of human beings—Kings and peoples, and the right modes of action, individual and social. It is a comprehensive science. It deals with the whole life of man here and here after. *Lokayānā* or the welfare of the world is its aim. Its main principle of action is based on the conceptions of *svabhāva* and *svadharma*. One man is to perform one function when he is of a particular *svabhāva* or *gūṇa*. One group is to lead one aspect of life when it is at a particular stage. *Karma* or action, *Puruṣārtha* or purpose done in this way will better his surroundings and himself and lead to the great goal "each for all, and all for God." There will be no perversion or confusion of functions, natures, and purposes of life. Man can get out of ignorance and evil and be trained for and follow good by his own exertion and experience. He can thus himself become and allow freedom to become perfect. Otherwise *nītiśāstra* will have no meaning or value. It emphasizes and lays down that the rulers and the ruled should strive for the greatness and welfare of *Rāṣṭra* or State. Both have duties and limitations. The relations of both are complementary and not conflicting or slave-like. This is the *Āryavartman* or the path of the Aryans.

Civics is a science. It lays down some laws or rules for guidance. But these laws do not possess the definite character of physical laws. They are in the nature of statements of tendencies noticed in a given material—man, time and environment. These statements of tendencies may form recommendations or warnings in future work under similar circumstances.

The character
of the laws of
Civics.

A scheme of complete life must consider man a relation or
The scope of attitude towards—
ivities

- (1) God
- (2) himself
- (3) neighbours and
- (4) environment

hence we may lay down the contents of CIVICS as follows —

- (1) Man or citizen and his associate

This leads us to the consideration of such associations
as family clan tribe caste community church
which are mainly social and cultural units

- (2) Man and his neighbour

This leads us to the study of home village town pro-
vince country empire world which are territorial
or neighbourhood units

- (3) Man and his God

This necessitates the knowledge of cosmos religion and
metaphysics

- (4) Man and his work

This deals with the problems of occupation or vocation,
such as agriculture, industry commerce arts, pro-
fessions and services

- (5) Man and his past

This concerns itself with his history culture, traditions,
heritages, institutions and beliefs, and also with
how man has manipulated environment, or en-
vironment has influenced man

- (6) Man and his future

This will relate to the acquisition of the knowledge of
the institutions and ideals of society and their
growth and to the application of that know-
ledge to an active devotion and moulding of the
community

(7) Man and the present.

This will take an account of the present conditions and needs. It will institute a social survey of the place, the work, and the people, and will endeavour to suggest formulas and rules of active work and social service. It will try to remove hindrances and difficulties and to satisfy wants.

Thus the province of Civics is the whole life or activities of man into which he enters, and the proper valuation and proper direction of those activities in the light of the past experience and future aims

The aim of Civics cannot differ from but must be in consonance with the highest aim of man and society. It may be stated to be the realisation of the highest good by directing and regulating man's activities into the right path. Full life and common good are the immediate ends of Civics. It wants to secure unity of life and progress. It wishes to preserve the acquisitions already made and to help the further development of civilisation. Civilisation is a continuity, a process and a gain. Mr. Whyte says that it is a conquest of egoism by altruism, or more truly, it is a balancing and harmonising of Mamatva and Samatva, of Svārtha, Parārtha and Paramārtha.

Civics wants to make man know himself and his relations to his surroundings, to find out his proper function and to perform it and to harmonise himself with his surroundings and *vice versa*.

Man is not perfect. He is a complex of good and bad tendencies. He is not endowed with equal qualities and quantities. He is alterable. He tends to rise and fall. There is something of a beast and a God in him. He is not also a free being, that is, his outer environment and inner vitality are his checks or limitations. But he has power to break these bonds. He is educable. His impulses, his reason and free will, his choice and calculation

can recreate him and his surroundings. Lastly, he is a social animal, and therefore possesses love, mercy, forgiveness and desire to serve and to sacrifice for others.

Hindus state him to be *Trigunātmaka* (*Sāttvika*, *Rajasika* and *Tāmasika*) that is, possessing three qualities and able to rise from the lower to the higher virtues. Rousseau calls him a gentle or mild savage. Hobbes depicts him as a warlike or wild savage, and Stoics as an emotionless sage. Christians view him as endowed with original sin. The most important aspect of his nature, however, is that he is a changeable or an educable being.

Man is a limited or conditioned being. Though his desires are boundless, his means are limited and his environment circum-

His limitations limit him. His traditions and associations check him. His physical weaknesses and endowments, which may be hereditary, parental or acquired, handicap his efforts and ambitions.

He is generally dissatisfied with his existing status. He wants to break the bonds of the past and the environment, to

His aims dominate nature and other men. But his chief aim is to preserve and to perpetuate himself, to express and to perfect himself, and to fraternise, to be free and equal with others. And in order to achieve order and progress or *Yogakṣema*, he subordinates himself, but in no servile sense, to the laws and customs of his city and country. He willingly obeys them because he is himself the author. Thus he appreciates order but is zealous for reform. What is worth having is, he believes, worth defending. Past is to be a safeguard for the future.

Man cannot live without food, shelter and clothing, and air, light and water. These may be called his objective requirements. He cannot live well unless he has freedom, education, knowledge, equality of opportunity, spirit of service, self-control and love. These may be termed his subjective requirements.

CHAPTER V

SOCIETY AND STATE

It is man's inner nature and outer necessity which leads to the rise of groups or associations. Some of them are temporary and others are permanent. The earliest asso-

G r o w t h o f
Society ciations or groups arise out of sexual needs or impulses, fear of the strong and need of self-preservation, parental impulses, necessity of co operation for heavier work, for example, capture of wild animals for food and clothing, respect or awe for a fictitious common god or ancestor or totem, and desire for peace and order. The earlier forms are sometimes loose, ill-regulated and herd-like. Consciousness of kinship, constancy of war and community of custom may strengthen their internal bonds and external taboos and may make them voluntarily progressive and aggressive societies! They then lose their primitive character of exclusiveness, and status, and become advanced modern societies, with a will and consciousness of their own, well-regulated and assimilative in character.)

(In these early forms family arises as the most suitable and widely prevalent unit. It dominates the development of all great civilisations. It is the first step towards

Family is one a stable and civilised life. Solitude charac-
of the earliest terises fishes and reptiles. They form no com-
associations. munities and do not help one another. They

live and die to themselves alone. Among the mammals some kind of family life is seen. Among the higher mammals some kind of fellowship is established. Thus horses, dogs, sheep, cattle, bees, ants show some kind of fellowship and organisation. Among the higher apes a distinct communal life is developed. But it is really amongst men that conscious communal life is evolved and organisation established. The first communities, some say, ever evolved among men were probably herds or

CHAPTER V

hunting-packs When man was a nomad and wandered in search of food and shelter he formed such hunting packs When he domesticated some useful animals such as dogs horses sheep, goats and cattle he formed in the pastures of Central Asia and Arabia large tribes of pastoral herds In other places on the banks of rivers or lakes where corn fruits and roots grew he established agricultural communities clans of cultivators in their sheltered fruitful valleys or in regions of rains and inundations Such regions have been those of the Nile Euphrates and Tigris the Indus and the Ganges the Hwangho and the Yangtse Acquisition of steady control over the resources of nature both animate and inanimate and a knowledge of their powers advanced these communities in their wealth stability and organisation and made them later on industrial and commercial

The primitive communities were necessarily small and exclusive, because it was difficult to find food for large groups of people, the means of communications were scanty or nil and the knowledge of arts and crafts had not advanced The hunters could gather food for the few The flocks of the shepherd required extensive grazing grounds The methods and means of early agriculturists were extensive and not intensive Hence there grew up many groups or communities often at war with one another in order to possess the means of livelihood Material means determined the character, growth and inter relation of these communities Constant wars strengthened the feeling of unity within the community gave rise to leaders, and ideas of authority and obedience, and evolved a system of co operation and a rudimentary civic sense

Further progress of civilisation depended on the gradual elimination of war and welding of warring communities into larger groups Co operation and comradeship,

The character of modern communities instead of conflict, were its motto This became possible because of forcible subjection and assimilation by one group of several others or by recognition of common interests of several neighbourhood but

warring groups. The idea of an Empire or Federation was the visible conglomeration of these ideas and achievements. To-day the aim of civilization is a single world state or community (*Varudhauva Kutumbalam*), in which all men and nations will live peacefully and fraternally. This goal has still to be reached. Today amongst the different communities or nations there has developed a corporate or a communal or a national feeling or morality which emphasizes devotion to the group, loyalty to comrades, and hatred towards foreigners. This has to be transcended into a larger co-operative commonwealth and into a widening of the spirit of comradeship. Society is therefore companionship or association where individuals are collectively considered, as being united or organized for some common purpose or need. It gives rise to a social will or a group consciousness which is a result of component human wills, and to an enduring organisation and certain definite relations in which associating individuals are bound together.

Society thus becomes something like an organism, moral as well as physiological, with a will and constitution based on differentiation of functions. It contemplates that the ethical progress and happiness of mankind are conditioned and moulded by this functional organisation of society. Mann and Plato emphasize this social division of labour as the basis and the true type of the ethical life, and the conception of society as a means to the perfection of human personality.

Society is not a physical organism. It is like an organism because its parts are in psychical relations. There is sympathy, interest and co-operation for and between various parts. It is in a way a psychical organism with a physical basis in individuals. It is really not so much an organism but an organisation because it is partly a product of unconscious evolution, and partly a result of conscious planning. This organisation is a complex of psychical relations. Like an organism it may exhibit every phase of evolution, a growth from simpler to complex forms and a differentiation of func-

Society
organism.

tions with increasing cohesion or integration. Like an organism it may also have an aim or purpose. The function of society is to promote conscious social life and to create and develop human personality.

THEORIES OF THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF SOCIETY

Society may be considered either as a mechanism i.e., artificial and deliberate or as an organism i.e., natural and evolved. It may be either a make or a growth.

1. The Organic Theory of Society. One school considers it as an organism like an organic body of an animal or a tree i.e., a body made up of many parts each one fulfilling a function for the whole body. They are like the five organs of knowledge and of action of man. Each individually can have no individual existence and importance. They exist for the whole. The whole does not exist for them. It also states that as an organism society has evolved through 'ages' and its structure has responded to the functions evolved under the influence of environment.

Thus society is identified with an organism because of certain similarities. Like an organism it grows, is influenced by and gives response to environment, and becomes a moral person. Its component members are allotted and perform various functions, deliberative, executive and so forth to carry out the social will. It is a necessity. Without it man cannot live, nor live well. It has a common purpose, and a life of birth, growth and decay. But, on the contrary, there are certain fundamental differences which mark it off from an organism. Cells of an organism have no moral capacity, will, reason or sense of good and bad. Individuals have these as their chief characteristics. They live independently, but cells cannot. Individuals are conscious and conscientious beings with a moral aim and individuality of their own. Cells are mere parts. Individuals are separate entities and personalities. Society may perhaps be characterised as a spiritual unity or whole, con-

sisting of spiritual beings or individuals co-operating for the general good

Social Contract theory contemplates a pre-social state of mankind, when man lived independently and not in society.

This pre-social state was one of peace according to some and war according to others. The golden age of peace could not last because it was not progressive, and increase of population and desire of possession of property could not maintain the old economic conditions. Men became aggressive and covetous for want of means or out of wickedness. Peace disappeared. War began. Therefore men felt the necessity of some joint organisation to establish peace and tolerance. Therefore they entered into a covenant to form a society to preserve peace or to protect life, liberty and property.

The age of warfare was the primitive condition of man according to Hobbes. It was the state of nature. It was a war of each against all and a state of *homo homini lupus*. It was found intolerable. Therefore a social covenant or contract was entered into amongst the people by which a dictator or sovereign was appointed to regulate the affairs of the new society which came into existence to make the *homo homini deus*.

Thus the state of nature and social contract are variously described. Some say that the state of nature was good and peaceful when men respected each other's rights. Men fell from it. Therefore society became necessary in order to re-establish the good and peaceful condition and to maintain it. But the controllers of society were given limited power. If they did not protect life, liberty and property, there was left power, to the members to rebel. Others say the state of nature was warlike or brutish. There were no laws or rights and it was intolerable and had to be ended. The society which was created gave its power to one person unconditionally to create rights by laws and to give a better life to the people.

In the state of nature man is supposed to have followed the law of nature that is the regulations which were prescribed to him by nature itself or rather the dictates of his natural spirit which inspired him to actions

Society really evolves from the early groups of kindred such as families and clans of primitive persons But as families

are not self-sufficing for purposes of extended and complex life and families increase, grouping of families on a fixed territory and their interrelatedness for a common purpose of political, material and social life takes place and leads to the formation of villages and

cities A union of these villages and cities leads to the formation of a country This union may be voluntary or compulsory, brought about to meet common needs and common dangers When such a forcible or voluntary union comes about, of villages and towns, a new territorial political, social and economic synthesis of various ideas and necessities of life takes place, and a state or nation is born with some common aims and aspirations with some common traditions and heritages for the preservation and achievement of which a strong feeling of pride and self-sacrifice comes into existence These higher groups may be mainly racial, cultural, religious or mixed in their early formation But unless a common purpose or aim inspires the general activities of their members in their mutual dealings, and unless each component element has and takes a necessary part in their common life, there is no nation, and there is no stability to its harmonious and continued existence

SOME POLITICAL TERMS

State is an independent, politically organised community existing and expressing itself as a whole primarily for preservation and secondarily for welfare of its members Aristotle says, "State exists for life in order, to move forward to the good life" (Politics, I.)

2. 8.) "State exists for the sake of a good life and not for life only." (Politics, III. 9. 6.) But modern writers confine the term 'State' to the political aspect of the organised community. It is an independent territorial association for political purposes. It looks to the people's common and comprehensive interests, and compulsorily regulates and controls every one who ordinarily dwells within its area. The essentials of a State are

- (1) Territory,
- (2) People,
- (3) Unity, and
- (4) Organisation.

The dominant idea in a State is not of race, religion language or culture, but of a common territory and a definite sovereign power exercising authority and exacting obedience from its members who are bound together for self-protection, that is, for peace, order and good government. Thus the state is mainly a territorial and political idea and unit, with an organisation of political institutions in which a proper determination of spheres of work and functions is carried out.

'Government' is the machinery or agency set up for administration and work by the State with definite powers and organisation. It consists of a person or a group of persons in whose hands the control and functions of the state are placed.

Government.

The word 'Nation' has been defined in various ways. Some say it is a group of persons so closely associated with each other by common descent, language or history as to form a distinct race or people usually organised and occupying a definite territory. But at present 'Nation' is more or less defined as a community of people possessing a geographical and political consciousness of unity and having a common desire to live together, and a common will and faith in its united progress. Take, for instance, the cases of Great Britain and Switzerland. They are not

Nation.

so much of one race, one language, one religion or even one culture, as they are of one ideal and patriotism. Each component part or group has made them self-sufficing for a greater and fuller life. The old ethnical idea of nation was based on a static aspect of society. The new cultural idea is based on its dynamic aspect. One relates to what it is the other to what it is going to be. Both the definitions involve a community of actual life or aim. One looks to the past, the other to the present and future of that community. B B 5 4

The term 'Nationality' is applied by some to this latter meaning assigned to the word 'Nation'. The words 'Nation'

Nationality and 'Nationality' have a common origin. They are derived from the Latin word natus meaning born. Many use them indiscriminately. According to some writers 'Nation' means State and something else in addition, which is, nationality—the unity of spirit of the people organised in one state. Thus nation is primarily a political term.

Nationality they consider is a spiritual sentiment arising amongst a number of people usually of the same race, residing on the same territory sharing a common language, the same religion, similar history and traditions common interests, with a common political association. Not every one of the elements, however, is absolutely essential nor also are all of them taken together. But every nationality has as a basis some one of them. Nationality is thus a spiritual term. Bluntschli defines 'nation' or 'nationality' as a union of masses of men of different occupations and social strata in a hereditary society of common spirit, feeling and race, bound together especially by language and customs in a common civilisation which gives them a sense of unity and distinction from all foreigners quite apart from the bond of the state.

A 'Country' when used geographically is a territorial unit, when used politically may be said to be the place inhabited by a nation.

'Race' is a group of persons connected by common descent or origin from a supposed common ancestor and regarded as a common stock. It is supposed to be a distinct ethnic type possessing certain physical peculiarities and perhaps traits of temperament, and habits of thought, feeling and action in common amongst themselves. e.g., Aryans, Dravidians and Mongolians are different races.

The term 'People' is often used indiscriminately for nation or nationality. It generally indicates a body of persons composing a community, tribe, race or nation, sometimes viewed as a unity, sometimes as a collective number. The term does not connote any racial, cultural or religious idea but a certain unity of tradition or sentiment. As against the rulers, it denotes the subjects.

'Humanity' means all human beings taken collectively, irrespective of their castes, colours and creeds, and is conceived as one unit with the idea of brotherhood and equality underlying its fundamental conception. It is thought that ultimately all human beings will live as one human family whose members will be bound by Dayā, Dāna, and Samatva (kindness, charity and equality) with no ill will but co-operation with all.

The word 'Community' indicates common life in association with others. It means people with a common feeling of oneness in religious, social, political or economic matters. It may be applied to a body of men living in one locality or country in intimate contact. Thus it signifies any whole area of common social life and shows common social characteristics.

The term 'Society' bears no reference to any territory or environment, but to man alone. It is a group of people bound together for some common purpose, function, motive or object. It is a general term applicable to a great number of different modes of unity among individuals. Thus it includes every kind of relationship entered into by men with one another.

'Family' is primarily the smallest biological association for race multiplication and preservation and, *secondarily* has cultural purposes and activities as the first social group and the first school or place of civic life. It consists of parents and their children whether actually living together or not. Its normal function is to secure what is best for the nurture of children i.e., to preserve their life and health and to educate them. A joint family is a continued living together of those descended from a common ancestor consisting of grandsons, grandparents, brothers, uncles and others who are joint in mess and property. It is thus an extended family.

Family is the first social circle in life. The chief person is the mother. Under her care and influence a man is trained in its atmosphere and discipline. His vices and virtues are partly due to its influence. He inherits there the spirit of the past culture in its existing aspect. It teaches him virtues of tolerance, love, service, sacrifice, charity and industry, and makes him realise the fact of the interdependence of his activities and the consequent necessity of peace and order. Thus it has an economical, educational, ethical and social value.

'Empire' consists of the territory or countries under the jurisdiction and dominion of an emperor, being usually of a greater extent than a kingdom, always comprising a variety in the composition of its peoples and in the forms of its administration over its subordinate portions. It originates in conquest. It is the rule of one country over other. It is a dominion of one and a dependence of others. There is no equality of political status or constitutional forms amongst its various components. British Empire is a great example in modern times.

'Commonwealth' is a larger state consisting of a group of smaller states united either by compact or tacit agreement under one form of government and one system of laws. This term is applied to governments which are free and popular. British Empire cannot be called

'British Commonwealth of Nations' until all its constituent parts are free and equal members of it and there remains no dominance of one over the others. Only the self-governing colonies of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and South Africa may be said to have attained that status. They are now described as 'autonomous communities' equal in status, in no way subordinate to one another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Every self-governing member is now master of its destiny. ✓

'Federation' is a political and constitutional union of formerly independent states which by consent merge their sovereign power in a larger central unit and exist as its constituent subordinate members. { Federation. The centre of sovereignty shifts to the Federation, and States possess defined and limited powers in certain matters. The whole organisation is laid down in a Constitution, adopted and approved by the uniting States, and amended in their national conventions.

Empire and Commonwealth or Federation are extended states. Their origin differs. Their aims differ. The one is despotic, the other is free. Empire may change its character by accepting the ideals, methods and constitution of Commonwealth or Federation, as in the case of self-governing members of the British Empire.

Hindus characterised State as possessing seven limbs or essentials (Saptāṅga), namely, sovereign (Svāmī), councillor (Amātya), treasury (Kośa), fort (Durga), people and territory (Rāṣṭra), army (Bala), and allies (Mitra or Sahāya). This Saptāṅga idea covers the modern idea of the essentials of a State. Sovereign represents the unity of the people, and the controlling and unifying centre of organisation ; Rāṣṭra represents population and terri-

tory, councillor, treasury and army represent internal organisation, and allies represent foreign policy and relations.

Without independence from foreign control and without supreme control at home a State cannot exist. Sovereignty is the chief characteristic of a State. It gives unity to the people, creates an organisation for their protection and maintains a system of

laws and administration for mutual dealings amongst men within a fixed territory. Unless there is a supreme power either embedded in laws or entrusted to a person— one few or many— and unless it is obeyed a State will not exist. Its constitution may take any form of government; its citizens or their groups may have any number of rights civil or political but the sovereign power must exist. Its limitations are either moral constitutional or functional. They may be either internal or external. Men may rebel against its lawless laws or despotism, internal groups may refuse its encroachment upon their non-political functions of life, other states may check its aggression and breach of treaties or of international morality. But for political purposes its power must remain supreme as long as it does not confuse or pervert its political function for disturbing other and higher functions of man's social life. Formerly religion and caste were the great driving, organising and educating forces in society. State dealt only with the political aspect of life in subordination to the moral and spiritual injunctions of religion and caste. Religion took its inspiration and its right to regulate from God-idea and caste from the idea of kinship and common customs. But State is now all in all. Spheres of religion and caste have been made subordinate to State as the central co-ordinating and coercive sovereign power. It is the all controlling force. Neighbourhood or territorial relations and interests are given a great social importance and the religious and kindred relations, a personal and local importance. State which was mainly a police or military organisation now has also become a moral association and personality.

The nature of the State has been variously determined and described, namely, as a lawgiver, as a force-holder, as an educator, as an organism with a general will, as a mechanism with a common or united will, as a super-personality with a real or transcendental will, as a mode of social unity or as an organisation for common political good. Each one of these characterisations has been fully supported or criticised historically or philosophically, but we shall find that each one of them emphasizes some one aspect of the nature of the State, if we survey the State during its various historical phases

In modern times it became a supreme lawgiver when politics came to dominate all other activities of life. In early times it was considered only an administrator of law, a mere maintainer of order and custom. At certain periods it rested largely on force and not so much on the consent of the governed. At others it could use force or hold power only when backed by the will of the people. Sometimes its educative nature was emphasized, at others its protective or preventive function was admitted. Some writers have tried to identify it with an organism with a general will and personality of its own, apart from the individuals who compose it. Others have merely compared it to a mechanism which individuals united in creating as a means to promote the will of all. Some philosophers conceive it to be a super-personality transcending the actual wills of individuals and possessing and manifesting a real or absolute will which is the most virtuous and rational, the best and the highest. In it the individual is subordinated and can have no independent value or existence. Others have merely accepted it as an organisation or association for achieving only the political function, as a mode of maintaining social unity by its powers of control, co-ordination and coercion. The various elements in State's nature have been thus emphasized according to its historical manifestations and writer's inclinations and experience.

This leads us to the discussion whether State even with its present importance is an end or a means to a higher end

Without it a man cannot exist. It is a means

Is the State a means or an end? To his better political life. To have a good State may therefore become a proximate end

but not the ultimate end. Man is not a mere

part of the State as Aristotle or Hegel would like to put it.

Amongst Greeks the whole life of man was organised in a city state which was considered the home of perfect life. A

stateless man was considered either a beast or God. There

fore the creation of an ideal State was considered the end of

man's endeavours because it was in such a State that he would

exist and become virtuous and lead a perfect life. The

identification of State with the whole society by the Greeks

led to the conception of the omnipotence of the State and

the idea of the State as only one association dealing with one

aspect or function of man's varied social life got suppressed.

Creation of the best man is really the end of society. He cannot

be made a mere part in the machine of the State. State is

the creation of man for a particular end. With its aid man

builds his higher life and raises himself higher. If State were

to be considered ultimately higher than man it would suppress

individuality, it would militarise man and reduce him to a

subordinate status, where his freedom may become unreal, his

aspirations standardised, his activities impoverished and vigour

less. Man is and must be always greater than the institutions

he creates and customs which he follows.

Society as we have seen is not only a growth but also a make that is, not only natural but also conventional. It is

partly based on instinct, partly on choice and

The Social Unit partly on the pressure of changing environ-

ment. It is not divine and fixed, once ordered

and once organised. Its unit, the man is rational and free to

mould it according to his needs, reflections and ideals. Its

organisation must be receptive and respond to freedom.

Society is for man and not man for society or its institutions.

Man is born for freedom and not for oppression, for happiness and not for misery. But this freedom and happiness are limited in the interests of general welfare. Each man must get a place in society to share in the whole life, and to perform his own function in consonance with and helping the welfare and functions of all. The ideas of the struggle for life and survival of the fittest are not what a man lives for and endeavours. Mutual aid and co-operation are more a social characteristic than the warring idea. Social calm and social vitality depend upon them and not so much upon lash of nature or law of man. The unit must be given opportunity to make mistakes and improve. The interference of authority should be only to remove obstacles. Its uniform compulsion is very likely to destroy spontaneity and free functioning of the individual according to his natural endowments. Interference becomes necessary because men act independently and yet affect one another by such action, and in order that such actions may not be hurtful to the interests of others, interference in the nature of a check or a deterrent is required. Individuals are not mere limbs and appendages of a social person whose life-value is to be considered the only and final end. It is the right of each and all to be considered as ends in themselves and not merely as the nerves and sinews of a social person or Leviathan.

Man is the prime centre in all social groups. He is the social unit, materially, morally and spiritually. Hindus recognised the individual as the social unit. His right to all the four *Puruṣārthas*, the four *Āśramas* and to *Dharmāntara* (conversion) and *Deśāntara* (emigration), indicate this aspect.

His social position. His social position and his social relations may be considered in the following ways:—

- (1) Is he an end or a factor in society? Or is he both?
- (2) Is society an end or a means? Or is it both?
- (3) What are the minimum wants, material, moral and spiritual to be assured to him along with other members?

(4) What are to be his social relations towards others? Man cannot live alone and hence he forms a unit or a factor of society which is necessary and natural for his being and well-being. His full existence and end are realised in society. Hence society is the means of man's advancement and welfare. Therefore it must possess an organisation, an end, and a purpose of its own. It must secure the minimum wants of man and strive for the satisfaction of his maximum wants, material, moral and spiritual. It must develop tolerance, sympathy, common feeling and common endeavour among its members.

Aliens are those who are living in one country but are citizens of another. They may have come for commercial, industrial, religious or even political purposes (diplomatic services). They are subject to the laws of the country in which they reside. They pay taxes, and generally enjoy all civil rights. But they have no political rights in the affairs of the country. They are not however beyond the pale of law or civil freedom.

They are treated in most respects equally with citizens. Except political rights of voting and holding any office there are very few other disabilities imposed on them. In times of war they may be interned or watched or even deported. But ordinarily their privileges and obligations are not different from those of citizens.

Those citizens who are not given political rights have been numerous in the past. Women, the propertyless, those of lower birth, minors, the morally unfit, and the physically unfit were not allowed to share in political power. Now under the system of universal suffrage women, the propertyless and those of even lower birth are admitted to this political right, and every one who is above a certain age, and morally and physically qualified to exercise his vote, is to be admitted to political franchise.

Voting quali-
fications of
citizens

The voting qualifications of citizens are generally these :—

- (1)*Those already enumerated above.
- (2) Residence for certain period and registration in the list of voters.
- (3) No plural voting

The method of voting followed in modern times is voting by ballot in order to keep secrecy and independence in voting.

Citizenship is generally acquired by birth within the territory of a State or by a process of naturalisation. Laws of a country lay down conditions and formalities about residence, loyalty, knowledge of language, oath, etc., which are to be fulfilled and observed. After that a person is entitled to a naturalisation certificate. Citizenship is lost by misconduct or becoming naturalised in other countries.

Citizenship embraces all those rights and duties which belong to the members of a properly organised society or state.

These are both legal and moral. The fundamental principle of good citizenship is that self-interest should be subordinated to general and national interests. The citizen should perform his private duties well and also take an active interest in public affairs, whenever necessary, in order that the general welfare of the society may be advanced. Legal rights and duties are those sanctioned by the State. Moral rights and duties are those approved by the general conscience of the community.

'Rights' relate to life, liberty, property, religion and pursuit of happiness, and their protection, or they may be classified as personal, civil, political, economic and religious. These are rights of self-defence, liberty of speech, association, movement, press, conscience and worship, and rights to vote and share in government, to equality

Rights.

A citizen's
rights, duties and
obligations.

of opportunity, minimum education and a minimum standard of living and assistance in distress and disease in the shape of poor law and medical help. Then there is the right to equality before the law to trial by a regular court, and to no imprisonment without trial and to proper administration of justice.

Public duties are roughly obedience to the laws of the State that is to commit no civil wrongs and criminal offences.

Public duties to pay rates and taxes to give vote which is a trust on behalf of the community to help in the preservation of public health and sanitation to educate and to take care of the poor diseased and distressed and finally to inculcate the virtues of industry thrift self denial spirit of independence loyalty and patriotism.

'Private duties' of an individual are those which concern himself and his family namely those of securing material

Private necessities conveniences and comforts and duties proper education and those relating to higher creative and spiritual aspects of life.

'Obligations' are more in the nature of moral duties. They are the virtues of toleration, service sympathy and help.

Obligations To lead a good and noble life, the life of an ideal man, and to take a proper part in the political affairs and social development of the country should be the chief underlying aim, so that

Yad yad ācaratī sreṣṭhah tattaddevetarō janah

Sa yā pramāṇam kūrute Lokastadanuvaratē

(Bhag Gītā III 21)

(Whatsoever a great man doeth, that other men also do the standard he setteth up by that the people go.)

Hindu ideas of rights and duties Hindus classified rights and duties as relating to

1. Svārtha or Deha (oneself)

2. Parārtha or Deśa (others).

3. Paramārtha or Deva (god).

The first emphasized the importance of self, the claims of body and mind ; the second, that of the neighbour, society and country, or caste and community ; and the third that of God and soul, that is, spiritual life.

In understanding the basis of these rights and duties the following points must be noted and remembered :—

- (1) Various units in society should be equally and properly treated.
- (2) Various groups should be properly balanced and their aims carefully valued and subordinated, the lower to the higher and the highest.
- (3) Vitiated and vicious parts should be carefully segregated and eradicated.

Then only the object of Civics which is to inculcate sound principles that should guide our mutual dealings with one another and which is to perform what is to the common advantage of all can be rightly secured. Men live peacefully and comfortably when they work in harmony with others, and respect the reasonable wishes and wisdom of others and do not offend them. Each member must recognise his place and function and perform his duties along with others influencing and serving them by his good life and by being influenced by others' good example. One must do some part. One must lay aside one's lack of interest. One must overcome one's spirit of indifference. One must discard the belief that some one else will carry on the work. Then will one be inspired, and will be a true and good citizen of the society to which he belongs. To help the weak and to regulate the wicked will be his constant endeavour in actual everyday life.

CHAPTER VI

GOVERNMENT

'GOVERNMENT' is the actual machinery and structure in which a state is organised and by which it is administered

It also means the person or persons authorised

The necessity of Government to administer It is the active part of the State

Without its existence and continued function

ing a State cannot exist There would be anarchy or what Hindus called *Mātsyanyaya* the logic of the bigger fish eating the smaller The strong would oppress and enslave the weak Life—liberty property and religion would not be safe Manu expresses this idea when he states that *balavadbhayādīkṣānārtam* (for protection against the fear of the strong) the King was created, that is, government came into existence The disadvantages of anarchy are well stated by Rāma to Sītā in *Rāmāyana* In *Mahābhārata Śāntiparva* Bhīṣma gives the chief causes of the origin of government where he states that Dharma disappeared and the strong began to oppress the weak, the social laws and morality disappeared religious practices were abandoned, and therefore a King was created

Whatever may be the character of the City of God or the Sun or of the Golden Age or Satya Yuga, historically a government has been a necessity, and to day we have not reached as yet the communistic position of 'the withering away of the State,' and of the humanising of man and the free federation of his voluntary groups Man is still not a god, and government is still not all evil It is a necessity in order to preserve man and his society in good relations and working order)

Origin of Government. There are four theories about the origin of government

(a) God gave the King

(b) War begat the King.

(c) People begat the King.

(d) Social living evolved the King.

Manu and Mahābhārata accepted the divine origin of King or Government. Manu says that for protection against the fear of the strong, and for the welfare of the world

Divine Theory. Right God created King (*Rājānamasṛjāt prabhuḥ*). In the beginning when people were Dhārmika

no one encroached upon others' living but respected each other's rights. There was no Daṇḍa nor Dāṇḍika necessary. But this state of affairs having changed, at the request of gods who were troubled, God Brahmā requested Lord Viṣṇu to give a good ruler to the people. He was to be virtuous and like Viṣṇu, whose Tejas (energy) entered in him. This theory led in the hands of some to attribute God's privileges and powers to a ruler and to government. The theory of his irresponsibility to law and to the ruled was worked up. He became as it were a God on earth with no limitations irrespective of his good or bad character, and whether he ruled in his own interests or in the interests of the people. Just and perverted forms of government were not distinguished, and the ruler was not made responsible for his actions and deposed in case of his vicious rule. The ruled had no right to rebel. The King was above law and absolute. His rights were hereditary. His powers originated from God.

A ruler could be conceived as created by God as everything else is. A good king may be considered like God, and ought to be like him in his virtues. But he could not be identified with God or made irresponsible and supreme like God in all cases.

When there was no representative government and various causes led to the rise of one man's rule, the idea that this ruler should be the best and like God in his attributes was natural and necessary. But when a hereditary system of rulers gave rise to some good and some bad rulers, this idea of the Divine

Right of Kings to rule irresponsibly became a tyranny and a historical and moral perversion

The right of rebellion against a wicked king was considered a crime and the belief prevailed that a bad king was sent by God as a punishment to a people. This killed political life and political aspiration

But other writers did not accept this theory of irresponsibility of the ruler and even his divinity. They admitted the right of the best ruler to rule that the best ruler is like God but not God and that his rule was to be according to law or Dharma. They asserted that he had no right to interfere with the dictates of Dharma and that the leaders of society had a right to depose him in case he was wicked and prone to Adharma. Unless he respected Dharma a right to rule did not exist in him. The conception of a Dharma king or constitutional sovereign was the only conception about the best form of government before the rise of representative forms of political institutions

Europeans worked up the theory of the Divine Right of Kings in the same way. The ruler had the divine right to rule, and therefore he was absolute irresponsible and above law. He could not be elected or deposed and even if according to Hobbes, once elected, he could never be deposed or controlled. Stuart Kings of England, Bourbon Kings of France, Hapsburgs of Austria, Hohenzollerns of Germany and Czars of Russia advocated and maintained the position of Divine monarchs, but ultimately failed before the rise and opposition of peoples

War begat the King. This is true in many cases of the foundation of new dynasties. The Teutonic monarchies in

Europe, the Rājput kingdoms in India, and Mohammedan dynasties both in the East and the West are a testimony to the partial truth of this theory. It is also true in cases where tribal republics passed into monarchies in course of history. This theory implies that government originated in force. It may mean a foreign rule

imposed by force, or the entrusting to a strong leader in war the political affairs of a group or people because he is able to exercise force in the interests of the ruled and thus to protect them from foreign invasion and internal revolution and anarchy. But though it explains partially the origin of some states, it does not explain the origin of the State, nor also its continued existence.

The possession of force may originate a new government or may recreate the old, but it does not necessarily mean the only power which creates it or maintains it. The consent of the ruled, express or implied, is also another factor in the origin and existence of government. We cannot accept Treitschke's dictum *Der Staat ist Macht* as fully true. Force is only one factor and is not the essence of the state.

People created the King. This is the view of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Bhīṣma and Kauṭilya also state a similar theory of the origin of government in the will of the people.

Social
Contract Theory.

Hobbes states that in order to end the state of nature, that is, the state of warfare among men, the people gathered together and agreed amongst themselves to give up all their power to a ruler who would be absolute, irresponsible and supreme and would rule the people. This agreement or covenant is known as the social or political contract. The chief characteristic of the contract is the irresponsibility and absoluteness of the sovereign.

Locke says that the contract took place between the people on one side and the prospective ruler on the other. The conditions were that he was to guarantee life, liberty, and property. If he failed, he was to be deposed. It was a bilateral and not a unilateral contract, that is, conditions attaching both sides. The ruler who was created was a constitutional sovereign and not an absolute one.

Rousseau's contract created a 'general will' of the people. They agreed each to give up all what they possessed in order to receive from and share in what they wanted from

the general will. Their original natural rights were reinforced in the newly created general will. The ruler to whom the work of government would be entrusted is to be a mere administrator appointed and dismissed by the general will of the people.

This Social Contract theory is analytical or philosophical, not historical. Such a contract is not found in history. Though no state has been created in a day's conference, it expresses the truth that ultimately people's consent is the basis of any legitimate rule. On their will depends the permanence of that rule. Force is only an accompaniment, not necessarily a permanent one of any rule. Even if it originates a government, it cannot maintain it for all times.

{ Government is natural and necessary. Men cannot live and live well without it. A ruler or government appeared in history not at any particular point as the deliberate creation of God, man, or war, but it came into existence unknown and unnoticed.

HISTORICAL
Theory of gradual
evolution

It evolved unconsciously in the beginning in simpler forms in response to environment and social needs of man. Later on when different forms were evolved and observed, and their good and bad points were noticed, a deliberate attempt was made to change old forms and plan new ones and more complex forms. This evolution of government was either an imitation of the authority of the patriarch of the family or an extension of his authority over an enlarged family or a group of families, that is, a clan or tribe. It grew up with family, pack, horde, clan or society. It was a necessary aspect of its life. It did not come into existence either before or after. Society and government grew up simultaneously. It may have changed hands, or its forms may have become complex or different in its evolution at different times and places, in response to environment and needs of man. But throughout it has been a gradual growth and evolution.

Sociologists have stated how the masculine element of authority in a society arises early in the persons of medicine-men and magic-men who are mentally superior, and develops politically in the hands of martial and machine-men who are both mentally and manually more advanced than others. It is the necessity and influence of these men which create gradually a well-organised state and government for the necessary purposes of peace and order in a group.

Thus at the basis of government lie the following ideas according to the above theories:—

- (1) The idea of the best ruler and his irresponsibility.
A constitutional ruler is the best
- (2) and (3) Force and consent are the two factors in the origin and maintenance of government. }
- (4) Government is a growth at first and later on a deliberate make at times.)

Sovereignty is the highest political power or force in a state. It extends over all persons, groups and things in the territory. Legally there is none superior to it. All must obey its mandates. Laws are Sovereign Power. its creation. It can make and unmake them at its will. Whatever rights a citizen enjoys, or duties he owes are laid down, sanctioned and guaranteed by it. No outside state has any legal right to interfere with it, no internal association or person has any legal right to oppose it. It is equal to other political sovereigns in its international status and it is supreme over internal persons and groups. Thus it has absolute and unlimited power. This power may be in the hands of one, few, many or all. But its commands just or unjust must be obeyed. The sovereignty may have arisen by general consent and depend on it, or it may have originated by the use of physical force and continue to subsist by it. In both cases the sanction behind its commands is actual force.

But morally there is a check on this sovereignty by the people from within whose sentiments and ideals of life it regulates or controls. It is the danger of internal revolution. There is a physical and moral limit from outside on its ambitions and acts. This is the danger of invasion, isolation or boycott by other states.

Though the sovereign is said to make and unmake laws, there is a permanent influence of the ideals, sentiments and customs of the community whose manifestation it is on its power of making laws or its general functioning. The question whether the sovereignty lies in the Parliament or the people is generally solved by stating that the legal sovereignty lies in the Parliament, and the moral sovereignty in the people. But people's consent is ultimately the basis and sanction of any rules or government.)

(A law is a command issued by a sovereign what Kautilya calls *Rājāsāna*. But this does not mean that laws can be enacted irrespective of the influence of social ideals, customs, sentiments and needs. There is a steady, unseen, unnoticed opposition to the laws passed which do not respect the wishes of the people. Even just laws, if they are against peoples' wishes and wisdom, should not be enacted and cannot be successfully enforced. Unless the people are educated to realise their value and utility, the laws will fail. Hindu writers often pointed out "*Yadyapi śudham lokaviruddham nākarāṇīyam nācarnīyam, or lokavikṛuṣṭam na kuryāt*" (If a thing is pure but against the wishes and wisdom of the people, it should not be done nor practised, or whatever is against the wishes and wisdom of the people should not be done). Law in its moral sense is an expression of justice or of an element of good life in terms of a command or a recommendation. Hindu conception of Dharma contained both sacred and secular law with spiritual and political sanctions of *Prāyaścitta* and *Danda*.)

Civics has use of both legal and moral laws for carrying out its object of good life and of social and moral reform.

Liberty is not license as law is not lash. Liberty does not contemplate freedom to do as one pleases, but freedom for common good. Man in relation to man in a group has necessarily some limitations. Liberty in society or civil liberty is a liberty in a particular environment and for a particular object. This liberty can be highest only if it ensures the object in view. Therefore liberty is not an antithesis to order or limitations but it is a synthesis of good order and full freedom, so that there remains full scope for individual initiative and growth, and social progress and reform. There cannot be an unlimited right to anything and everything or to do anything. This conception will lead to conflict and warfare and not to peace and order amongst men, which in turn will result in the tyranny of the strong, and the enslavement or destruction of the weak. There will then be no liberty. Therefore to give equal liberty to all, some regulation and check will be necessary. This can be done only by enacting and enforcing some laws by some common and recognised and determinate superior. Then only will be realised the real liberty, which is that one is not to be the cause of the destruction of the liberty of another. Lord Acton implies by liberty the assurance that every man shall be protected in doing what he believes his duty against the influence of authority and majorities, custom and opinion.

Liberty may be mainly classified into four kinds :—

- (a) Civil Liberty.
- (b) Political Liberty.
- (c) National Liberty, and
- (d) Religious Liberty.

In the relations between man and man, and man and the state, certain laws of association and behaviour, certain rights and duties as regards life, liberty and property are to be observed and enforced. These laws, rights and duties are included under civil laws and criminal laws. They maintain 'Civil Liberty.'

'Political Liberty' is the right to share fully in the political power of the country that is, in the affairs of the government

P o l i t i c a l Under it come Universal Suffrage Responsibility of the Executive to the Legislature, Initiative Referendum and Recall, Election of the Executive Declaration of the Fundamental Rights Supremacy of Law, Trial by Ordinary Courts and not Administrative Courts, Local Self government and other similar matters

'National Liberty' means the full independence of a country and its sovereign status Such a country is generally recognised as a unit in International Law and

N a t i o n a l has full control over its foreign relations and policy This independence is the prime necessity for a strong political civil and cultural life The full dependence or quasi dependence of a country or nation on another nation largely destroys the springs of various forms and aspects of the life of a people A citizen degenerates under such conditions and becomes atrophied in progressive elements of his character

'Religious Liberty' is the right to worship according to one's choice and desire It is the liberty of conscience or individual liberty where no compulsion in tenets forms and oaths of a particular religion is practised Under it may be classed the

R e l i g i o u s liberty of education There should be no compulsion in matters of religion and education Both mould the individual in his spiritual and mental inclinations and equipments These are to be left free to grow from within as far as possible

All these liberties are a departure from what may be called the 'Natural Liberty' which may be described as unrestrained, unregulated, aimless, unequal freedom All the attempts of man have been to give up this brutish freedom where no good life or even peaceful life is possible for want of any organisation, system, limits or purpose ✓

'Constitution' is essentially a political order which has grown and been established and is now growing in a country

It is generally a creation of the peoples themselves. It is not an imposition by one on another. In certain cases there may be a technical or legal recognition of the political desires and attempts of the one by another, because of their historical connections.

Constitution.

A constitution is the form and organisation of a particular state, embodying the principles or rules, according to which the powers of the government, the rights of the governed, and the relations between the two are adjusted.

Constitutions are now generally written. Formerly they were mainly unwritten. English Constitution is both written and unwritten, though it is gradually losing its written and unwritten character. Some constitutions are flexible, that is, easy to change, others are rigid, that is, changes can be brought about not by ordinary processes of legislation, but by extraordinary and complicated methods. English Constitution is the example of the first, and American Constitution of the other. { Besides the definite rules laid down there are a number of customs and conventions which grow up with a constitution and make its functioning easy and peaceful, and which are in harmony with the main principles of the constitution. } The Cabinet system in England, and its composition and powers, are purely a matter of convention, and not of any enactment.

A constitution should be comprehensive but stated in brief and definite outlines. It should be flexible and not too rigid so as to make changes and progress neither too difficult nor a matter of revolution.

Modern states are not isolated or self-sufficient in character but form parts of a world community and are affected by or connected with other states in various aspects, namely, political, moral, religious, intellectual and economic. They mutually share in one another's peace, welfare and ideas of common good. These factors contribute to unity, association and inter-

International Relations.

dependence amongst states. Relations of one state with another are not regulated by any common superior because there is none. Hence each state is fully independent and equal in its foreign relations. But in course of history certain principles and rules have been evolved by European States in their mutual relations during peace and war. They are known as International Laws or Morality and guide the conduct of nations. There is no one superior body to enforce them and therefore they cannot be called 'Laws' in the Austinian sense, or commands of a superior. They are mere rules recognised individually by each nation as useful. There is no legal sanction behind them but only a moral or utilitarian binding. The nations recognised by International Law are considered 'a family of Nations'. They possess a diplomatic service, namely that of ambassadors, consuls, plenipotentiaries and others who carry on mutual relations in times of peace.

The Versailles Treaty of 1918 has now created a 'League of Nations' by a covenant wherein a superior organisation is created to deal with International problems so that disputes may be settled by a Court of Nations. The League of Nations Council or Assembly of the League. This League consists of a number of states and wants not only to prevent war and international conflicts, but also to promote international solidarity and welfare by looking after labour problems, medical problems, medical relief and backward peoples in mandated territories. It has a permanent Secretariat, an Assembly of Self-governing Nations, a Council and a Court, and various committees to deal with various international problems, and thus try to maintain peace and welfare of the world. It has no army or navy of its own, but the great powers have agreed to help with their resources and forces the ideals of international peace and welfare embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations and promoted by it. This is one of the greatest steps towards international arbitration, towards peace, freedom and welfare, which will help nations in achieving the highest ends of humanity.

Forms of Government may be classified as normal or perverted, constitutional or arbitrary, absolute or limited, democratic or despotic. Hindus described them as

Forms of Government		Vinīta, or Durvinīta, Nyāyya or Viparīta
Hindu classification	classi-	Dharmya or Adharmya.

Aristotle classified them into three normal and three perverted forms

Aristotle's classification	Monarchy or the rule of one, Aristocracy or the rule of the wise few, and Polity or the rule of the poor many were normal forms that is, they looked after the interests of all and Tyranny or the rule of one, Oligarchy or the rule of the rich few, and Democracy or the rule of the poor many were perverted forms, that is, they looked after the interests of the rulers and not the welfare of all the people.
----------------------------	---

These were the old recognised classifications of forms of governments till the rise of modern ideas of governments and their complicated structures. To-day governments are classified into Despotic and Democratic forms, Federal and Unitary, Parliamentary and Presidential types. A comparative study of constitutions of various countries gives us these various forms.

Modern classification	Despotic and Democratic forms.
-----------------------	--------------------------------

Despotic governments are irresponsible and unlimited by any law. Democratic are limited and defined by laws or constitutions and chiefly rest on the consent of the governed. They are constitutional or according to law and not arbitrary. In some states there are kings bound by law and constitution. They are called Limited Monarchies. In others, where there are no kings but elected presidents, they are termed Republics.

The 'Parliamentary' form of government is also known as the 'Cabinet' or 'Responsible' government. In this form the tenure of office of the Executive is dependent on the will of the Legislature and its members are chosen from amongst the members of the Legislature. Responsibility to the Legislature

The Parliamentary form.	the tenure of office of the Executive is dependent on the will of the Legislature and its members are chosen from amongst the members of the Legislature. Responsibility to the Legislature
-------------------------	---

is its keynote. Ministers must resign on the passing of a vote of want of confidence by the Legislature.

The 'Presidential form of government' is one in which the tenure of office of the Executive is independent of the will of the Legislature and its members or the Chief President are elected independently by the electorate. Separation of powers legislative executive and judicial is its keynote. The Executive need not and does not resign on a vote of want of confidence by the Legislature. It does not owe its existence to it. Its members are not allowed a seat on the Legislature. The President appoints or removes them at will. They are his advisors or subordinates.

'Federal Government' is the common or central government of any union entered into by two or more states. It has generally a written constitution, by which the powers and functions of the government are divided or distributed amongst the central or federal bodies and various federating states or local governments. But the Federal Government is more important powerful and sovereign than its component states. The creation of a federal state annihilates the separate sovereignty of component states, and these states become part and parcel of the common central state, possessing only powers and functions guaranteed by the federal constitution, and not by federal government.

'Unitary Government' is one in which the organs of local authority, namely, provincial and county bodies, and their powers and functions exist by a delegation from the central governments. The local units are its creation, and are not organised and guaranteed by the constitution. It can terminate their existence or alter their form by virtue of its own laws. The central government possesses all powers and is supreme.

'Functions of Government' are generally divided into essential and optional, or according to Wilson, constituent and ministrant. Without the performance of the first a state cannot exist and without the care of the second it cannot be good or perfect.

Essential functions are in the nature of protecting or possessing what is essential to a state's existence. The following items fall under them: defence, order and peace, law, maintenance of international position, prevention of crime, distribution of justice, taxation, currency, and other fundamental matters. They roughly relate to the protection of life, liberty, property, civic organisation, justice and public finance.

Optional functions care mainly for the welfare of the people. They want to create better conditions of life. The following items fall under them: education,

public health, sanitation, protection and encouragement of industries, regulation of trade and commerce, care of the poor and medical relief, labour interests of trade unions and famine reliefs, and standardisation of weights and measures, co-operative movement, management of charities, railways, waterways, maintenance of asylums, hospitals, reformatories, and pleasure-houses, prohibition of drugs and drinks, town-planning, parks, museums, and others leading to the common welfare.

Hindus divided the functions of government (Śāsanādhikāra) into Nigraha and Anugraha, or Kṣema and Yoga functions.

One relates to the removal of thorns or checking of evils called Kaṇṭakaśodhana, the other to doing good or to the acquisition of the good called Dharmasthīya functions.

Dustasya daṇḍaḥ sujanaśya pūjā nyūyena kṣāśya

ca samparīddhiḥ,

Apakṣapāto 'rthiḥ rāṣṭrarakṣā pañcaiva yajñā kṛtā

nṛpāṇām.

(Atri Samhitā 27.)

“ Punishment of the wicked, favour to the good, legitimate acquisition of state finances, impartiality in the distribution of justice, and protection of state, these are declared to be the five duties of the King or according to Kālidāsa in *Raghu-varṣa*, *Prajānāṃ vṛṇayādḥānad rakṣanadbharanādapi*, education, protection and welfare of the people ’

In the early stages of government restraint, coercion, punishment or *Danḍa* is practised more often more severely and more widely in order to check man in his lower or evil impulses and make him more social or neighbourly. Small offences bring on comparatively severe punishment. This becomes necessary in order to habituate man to the spirit of obedience, order and peace tolerance and service. Later on, having achieved a certain stability in these political or social virtues, persuasion or *Sāma* is adopted more and more in order to lead man in his progress towards a better life. He is more to be guided and led and not checked or punished. Therefore lesser or milder forms of punishment are adopted because the underlying idea is that man should not become stubborn or vicious by hard punishment, but should be made to realise his faults and to improve by showing him better ways of life. Therefore the value of *Danḍa* or punishment becomes minimised and that of persuasion or *Sāma* becomes emphasized.

Kauṭilya says that *śikṣnadanḍa udvejanīyah*, *mṛdudandah paribhūyate*, *yathārhadanḍah pūjyah*, and that every punishment for any offence must be *spaṣṭa*, that is definite and fixed.

In dealing with the theories of the functions of government the problem is whether the governmental interference in the life of the people should be minimum or maximum, that is, what should be the proper sphere of its operation for general benefit.

The Individualist view is that of minimum control of government, that is, only few constituent functions should be left

to it Government is considered by this school not necessarily good. Its interference is to be only for police purposes. The individual is to be left largely free. Laissez-faire is its policy.

The Socialist view The Socialist view is that of maximum control by government. The State socialists or Collectivists advocate this position. To them state is a positive good, and it should be given more functions. It is a cultural and educational state and not only a police state. The individual does not understand all his interests and even if he does, he cannot secure them without the state looking after them, and securing them.

There is a third view, that of the Communists or Anarchists who do not want the state at all or any control. To them man will perform his tasks and satisfy his needs by forming voluntary associations, and being naturally good, will not quarrel with others if proper conditions of equal and national life are secured at first.

The Individualist view The Individualist view rests on the ground that the individual has a natural right to be left alone, that he knows and pursues self-interest better and that he should be allowed to struggle for himself and survive or fail according to his fitness. He should be allowed self-development. Three good results are most likely to follow from this. Only the fittest will survive; there will be a variety of individual types, and they will endeavour and work, and thus society will be so much richer and self-sufficing. There will then be no uniformity of types of the same monotonous and lower level of lethargy and without initiative or enterprise.

The evils of the laissez-faire theory and individualistic attitude of the survival of the fittest and of the exceptionally able became apparent, after the Industrial Revolution, in the worst conditions of labourers in factories. Free contract, competition, and state indifference led to inhuman conditions of life, and it was

easily seen how the *strong preyed upon the weak* or the badly circumstanced, and if man was let alone he hardly understood his interest or could pursue it under adverse conditions and powers. The non interference principle led to evils which had to be eradicated. One could not divorce individual from his social rights. Pure individualism is impossible. Some regulation and control is necessary in the interests of the individual. Co operation and regulated effort alone make them possible.

The Socialist view rests on the ground of associated effort and joint control which prevent waste and unnecessary com-

The Principles of the Socialists *Principle* petition and which are more effective in production and equitable in distribution, and which give opportunities to all protect the weak and the helpless against the strong and look to joint social progress as the best way of individual progress and happiness. The isolated man will succumb in adverse circumstances and will be at the mercy of the unscrupulous and fraudulent. There is no fair competition in an ill-regulated or individualistic society. The old Mātsyanyāya to prevent which the state came into existence will reappear in a different but hurtful form.

The best position is to adopt the middle view in which the exceptional or the able man is not suppressed and the weak or the helpless is allowed scope and opportunity for development under guidance and control. This will prevent war between classes, between the rich and the poor, the unscrupulous and the needy or helpless. The functions of the state should be both constituent and ministrant, not only police but welfare functions, adopted according to the needs and abilities of the people. It should look after the common interests of all, give them material and moral security and chances of a better and virtuous life.

The relation of the State to the individual and the non-political groups, such as religious churches or Sanghas, economic

guilds or unions, educational bodies or Vidyapithas may be

considered from two different points of view. The relation of the State to the individual and the Group. If the State is taken to be omniscient and absolute, or a 'perfected rationality,' or manifesting the real will of the community, or to be the highest end, then it should possess maximum control over individuals and groups. In this case no resistance to the State is generally justified either on behalf of the individuals or the groups. But if the State is considered to be only a means or a necessary evil, then it should be given minimum control over individuals and groups in order to remove evils in their path and only the powers of co-ordination and coercion over them. In this case resistance to the State is justified in the interests of higher laws and morality, if it encroaches upon aspects which are outside its allotted scope. The individual and the group are here considered to have a real and independent character. No doubt, certain limitation by the State is allowed in adjusting conflicts and in adjudicating upon the interests of other individuals and groups. State does not however represent morally, rationally, or socially any unlimited sovereignty.

CHAPTER VII

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

METHODS of organising a government in modern times depend on the recognition of the ideas of representation, election majority rule party system interests of minorities proper separation and balancing of legislative executive and judicial powers, ministerial responsibility bicameral system recall, referendum and initiative, local self government devolution and decentralisation and amendment of constitution These matters have to be properly discussed related to the political capacities and traditions of the people, and finally approved and laid down Then only the structure of government can be completely organised and would work smoothly

In order to do this a short survey of Politics and the problems of Democracy is necessary

The fundamental bases of political thought and action are not first suggested or realised in ideal or simple conditions of human life Perfect peace of mind and happy harmony of ideas amongst a group of people do not promote complexity of thought and

Rise of political thought
Readers of Mahābhārata know that a theory of kingship is propounded in Sāntiparva In reply to a question asked by Yudhiṣṭhira, the venerable Bhīṣma stated that in the beginning there was no king as all the people lived harmoniously, each performing his own duty and enjoying his own right But later on when Kāma Krodha vices usurped their minds, their life became complex, and struggle and rivalry arose Then Lord Brahmadeva as a boon gave those afflicted people a king and wrote the Science of Dandanīti or Politics

for their guidance in the conflicting affairs of their worldly life. The value of this story to us is this that men must be actuated by conflicting motives and placed in compelling circumstances before any high and subtle ideas of politics can arise and before any rules for their guidance can be framed.

In our early days it used to be a maxim with some of our teachers and contemporaries that 'a conquered nation has no politics.' It is essentially a maxim of let-me-nation and live class of pseudo-thinkers, writers and leaders. Born to delude the world with high-sounding words and phrases, they have maintained the cause of inaction, inculcated the spirit of do-nothingness and perpetuated the rule of corrupt thinking and practice. As false prophets and philosophers they have given us the philosophy of the weak, painted for us the wrong side of conservatism and helped to take away the element of initiative and enterprise from the life of men. Do not those, who try to spread this belief, mean by politics political life and political thinking?

Politics pervades the life of every nation, free or conquered. Every conquered nation must have political life and political thinking if its people cared for it. A people organised under any form of government have political life; and political thinking starts amongst them when they are dissatisfied with that form of government or the methods of its rule. When a people ruled by its own rulers, or if conquered, governed by aliens, feel the tyranny of that rule, see that there is no identity of interests and believe that a better social life and ideal may be achieved if a new form of government is adopted, or if any changes in its policy and methods were made, then there we find the beginnings of political thinking. When a people, who have chosen their own rulers or rather acquiesced in the rule of the existing government and in the form of that rule, begin afterwards to realise that some modifications or an entire revolution in the form, policy and methods are necessary, then there we see the desire and action of politics. Why a nation or a people ruled over by alien conquerors, who differ in interests

and ideals from the conquered, should not feel dissatisfied and wish or try some change either in the form, method or system of their rule, is a proposition which is difficult to grasp much less to understand. If a people whether free or conquered, who are progressive in their ideas of life, can see what reforms or methods of reforms will make them more happy, prosperous, self respecting and self sufficient it is difficult to understand what should prevent them from having a political thinking of their own. Both free and conquered nations must have and follow political life and thinking. Because a nation is conquered it does not mean that all her powers of thought, speech and action are or can be taken away. Every conquered nation, in which instincts of self respect, freedom and progress are not extinct, wants to be free to develop itself and in its efforts to grow according to its natural bent, it does lead a political life and evolve a political thinking of its own. Of course it has to struggle against restrictions which are not of its own making. But in that struggle itself it creates a history of its political life and thinking, and thus furnishes facts for the formation of theories of political philosophy or science. It is however true that this political life and thinking of a nation can never be stereotyped. It must change to suit its ideals and to adjust itself with surrounding forces.

It is stated with pride by European writers on politics that the first home of intense political life and thinking in Europe was Greece. But we must clearly understand that

Re- of
Politics in Greek
city states it was Greece, not as one united country or under one form of government but as a country containing many independent city-states, each with its own different form of government, its own race of people, its own history of colonisation and traditions, with its own quarrels and wars against neighbours, its own ideals and ambitions, that was the chief cause of the intense political life and thinking which prevailed there. Greece was merely a geographical expression in those days. She had no political unity. The city-states which constituted Greece were

not always free. One state conquered another, for example, as Athens and Sparta did. Some had their own rulers, others were often ruled by aliens and were absorbed by them. Their forms of government differed. Some were dissatisfied with their own form, others were adopting a new one. The smallness of the city-states, the constant changes in their forms of government, the usurpation of one by the other, their constant quarrels and wars, internal as well as foreign, the great opportunity afforded them to compare and to realise the importance and weakness of their complex political life, gave a stimulus to their powers of thought. Among them political thinking arose out of necessity, and not because they were in any way, without any reference to their circumstances, specially qualified for it. There was no political thought in Greece before she had led many centuries of life of the kind related above in her history.

Then there is another fact to be remembered in connection with the political life of these city-states. The ruling authority interfered in and regulated almost every item of the life of their citizens. This was due to their smallness. When a government which rules over a people by doing only the police work of keeping internal order and the work of repelling foreign invasion and does not interfere in all the activities of its subjects, then there is very little intense political life and consequently political thinking. This has always happened in great countries which were under one rule. Therefore important differences between the life of tiny Greek city-states and that of other great states or empires must be first realised in reading Greek history. It is only then that we can understand why political life and thinking became intense in Greece.

Plato and Aristotle, fathers of systematic political thinking, were born in these city-states. They were the pioneers of

Plato's and Aristotle's the experience of the life of their city-states, Politics. the knowledge of their past history and the wisdom to compare and value it. They were born amongst a

people who were already doing political thinking out of necessity. They only systematised the facts gathered by their experience, knowledge and wisdom and formulated some criticism of the old structures and suggested some theories and valuations for guidance in future. They studied comparatively the advantages of different forms of government in order to find out how a state could be preserved and its ideal—the highest good—attained. This they did by suggesting new forms and methods of political life to satisfy the thinking minds of Greece already dissatisfied with the political life of their states. To them the city-state was everything. They did not conceive of the theocratic and feudal state of the middle ages and the great political state of modern times. What they had very little idea of the coming Empire of Philip and Alexander, the existing Empire of Persia and the past Empires of Egypt, Assyria and Babylon. The tiny city-states, with their small surrounding territories with their internal rivalries and external fears, with a large dependent non-Greek helot population furnished them with food for thought and comparison and with its help they formulated a political philosophy of their own so as to raise their city-states to a higher level of peace and progress, security and stability, prosperity and civilisation.

If we adopt the maxim that a conquered nation has no politics, then how are we to read the facts of European history?

European History and Politics. Every people and country in Europe were conquered some time or other in their history.

But while in that state of subjection, they did lead a political life and did formulate political theories, because whenever they were entangled in the clutches of political diplomacy, social tyranny and foreign war and yoke, their political activities as well as thinking became complex intense and suggestive. The history of writers on political philosophy and of political movements and vicissitudes in Europe shows clearly that there is nothing to prevent a conquered nation from having politics. Therefore the maxim mentioned above is false and the facts of European history give a lie to it. It is but natural

that conquered nations, feeling the pressure of their conquerors' rule, seeing around them everywhere free nations with different forms of government enjoying a better life of free will and progress, initiative and enterprise, should strive for a new political life and adopt a new ideal and philosophy suited to their further development. There is nothing wrong or impossible in it. As soon as they formulate some new thoughts and try to work them out to improve their life according to their natural bent and desires, they have political thinking and action, in short, politics. That life and thinking may be narrow and circumscribed, may not be as wide, developed and growing as that of other free peoples but it is all the same political life and thinking. Political philosophy must be related to man's life. It arises only when a people struggle for a better ideal and form of government, and conquered nations do struggle for it. In all branches of investigation it is the differences and not similarities of observed phenomena that give or create the first impulse for speculation or theorising. Unless there is change and movement, variety and diversity in the observed phenomena, there will hardly be any stimulus to speculation.

There is another misconception to be removed. There used to be a belief that Indians did not do any political thinking. It was obviously a wrong belief. Not

Indian and
Politics.

only was there in India a political life where her peoples lived in the past under particular systems of government, fought their battles, observed their laws and advanced their interests, but there was a political philosophy which was based on the social experience and ideals laws and customs of her peoples. The history of India commenced long before Mahmud of Ghazni plundered Somnāth or Clive cheated Umichand and Warren Hastings looted the Begums or Wellesley advocated the policy of separate peace. The political doctrines, the rules of government, the regulations to be strictly observed in war, and the laws to be maintained in inter-state relations or to be applied to conquered nations,

as laid down by Brhaspati Śuktiācārya and Cānakya and by numerous writers of other schools of political thought the political institutions and arrangements of Candragupta Asoka and others do show that India not only led a vigorous political life but speculated on politics

We must first at once concede that early primitive societies had very little political consciousness That human activities

Primitive So. can be differentiated and studied to a certain
 tiety and Poli extent independently without losing sight of
 tics their fundamental relations is a realisation of
 higher forms of mental processes The study of man's activities
 should both be synthetic and analytic To base the experience
 of man on the sure foundations of some fundamental laws his
 life must be studied as a whole and in details But when man
 is in a primitive condition of society it is not possible for him
 to realise that his activities can be classified from different points
 of view Political consciousness as apart from other human
 consciousness, is difficult to find among primitive communities
 Amongst them all human relations and activities are purely
 sociological They are mixed Amongst them man's mind
 does not discriminate clearly its own relations Vagueness
 ambiguity and uncertainty surround them

Political consciousness rises only when man begins to
 differentiate clearly his own family or tribe from government
 or state The idea of a ruling power as dis-

Rise of poli- or
 tical conscious- tinct from the family or clan of the course
 ness . of human life it regulates and of the human
 relations it controls, gradually reveals the political side of man's
 activities and formulates a theory and practice of political life
 and philosophy of people In other cases, before the rise of
 a distinct political consciousness in a people and of a distinct
 political theory, we find in the history of early communities the
 complete intermingling of the ideas of politics, ethics, juris-
 prudence, religion and economics Even Plato's treatment of
 politics is only incidental to ethics and metaphysics, while

Aristotle's treatise on Politics is not independent of his treatise on ethics. Plato's thoughts on politics do not reach the form of a science, both independent and systematic.

Political science deals with a certain department of human life and action, with a certain branch of man's external relations with his fellowmen, with certain aspects and factors in the period of man's complex evolution as a social being. It is particularly concerned with a certain species of social relations. In it we study the general problems of social relations from a definite point of view. This science is based on the assumption that it is possible to divide man's life into different departments, aspects, tendencies, and though no clear line can be drawn between political and other social relations, still a process of separation and isolation is possible ; at the same time we have to bear in mind that there is an intimate connection and a kind of inseparableness between this science and other human sciences. Man's activities, though divisible from different points of view, do not move in water-tight compartments.

The social life of man takes many forms. One of the most obvious and necessary is that of government. Man inevitably through the circumstances of his own nature and by force of his surroundings is a member of some society, the life of the individual member of which is controlled and guided by an association as a corporate body. Man alone would be devoured. Man in society can alone exist. The moment we admit society, even the society of one person, we admit limit and external pressure, whether willingly accepted or not, because it is recognised as the best way of life. Society arises to protect the whole, and the State or Government arises to make life possible and it exists to make life good. Therefore for man State is a necessity. There is no question of Man against State. State is meant to control men's relations with one another and to protect them from foreign foes, so that they may live and progress harmoniously.

In every discussion of the problems of political science it is necessary to determine the scope and province of that science itself and to define its relation to other departments of human knowledge of a similar nature. The term 'Political Science' has been used by different writers in different ways. It has been applied with vagueness and ambiguity in good treatises much more so in conversation. Social Science tries to find out laws which guide the actions of man when acting as a member of a group. Political Science is on the other hand a particular science dealing with a particular group namely, State which is possessed of a single Government. It deals with man's common life as a member of a State. Of course such a State or group will have other aspects than political as well. Probably it will be a religious society. It will certainly be an economic society either self-contained if the State is protectionist or dependent on others if it be a free trader. But political Science isolates the political aspects of a society and only considers others so far as they affect the State.

It is necessary here to state the relation of theory to practice in politics. Theory attempts to discover rules in the sense of uniformities observable in the actions of a fixed and given material. The search for such rules or uniformities is intended that they should not only be demonstrative but directive, if not mandatory. They are to control and to guide the material which is alterable and controllable. Political theory does this with regard to its own material. As Logic tries to discover rules which guide human reasoning so Political Theory tries to discover rules which are observable in political life, institutions and organisations of man in order that they may serve as a guide or basis for his further efforts in the same direction. As there was logical reasoning before the science of Logic so here were good States or political organisations before the science of Politics. As Logic only systematises and explains so Politics only tries to systematise and explain the facts of good

political life and draw inferences or rules therefrom. The gain from such an explanation is that it mainly justifies the ways of the State for individuals. As logic investigates the rules which should guide valid reasoning, so political theory investigates rules which should guide the actions of a healthy community. For example, Plato and Aristotle seek to issue precepts to cure diseased or wrangling states of Greece in the fourth century B.C., to direct construction of new states or colonies, etc. So also in modern times political theory has again and again sprung from the need of solving vexed questions of political life and its relations to and influences on other activities of man. In the middle ages and till the eighteenth century the mainspring of political speculation was what the relation of the Church and the State, and the Crown and the Legislature should be, as in modern times it is how the Government should be controlled by the people, or how the people can best take part in directing the affairs of the State and what the real end and aim of the State should be. The relation of capital to labour gave rise to modern Socialism, political as well as economic. The relation of one people to another or the forcible dominion of one state over another has given rise to a fresh form of political speculation and action in the twentieth century. It may be said therefore that political theory tries to lay down an ideal which should guide a corrupt or imperfect political condition of things. It must be noted here that political theory is mainly the product of radical thinkers. Conservative thinkers theorise only to confute the new theories.

Political practice depends on the character of the people of a country. A people who are precedent-loving, who look for guidance like the English in their legal precedents, who shape their present life through new interpretations of old rules, fictions or formulas, have no occasions to formulate new radical theories. Their political practice is a continuous adjustment. They are essentially conservative. They try to interpret the old in a new fashion and modify their practice only when

Conservative
and radical
theories.

forced by powerful external circumstances or internal upheavals. They muddle through towards progress. They start no new political theories. But a people who are idealists like the French try to work out new problems logically, formulate new theories and try to apply them and spread them. A people of the English type have a peculiar life which is continuous. But a people of the French type have breaks in their history. There are marked epochs and divided periods in their life. New theories modify their political practice in a new fashion. A people of the first type are hard to move, of the second easy to excite. The first are always avoiding and putting it off, the second are ever experimenting and hurrying it on.

A study of modern life shows two distinct forces controlling the actions of man: the one acting through the State and controlling directly the collective or group life of man in the name of law and justice; the other governing that life individually in the name of morality or religion. Rules of morality operate as effectively as those of State law, though there are no agencies continually working to produce precision in those rules. Thus there is a public life of man in relation to and as controlled by the State, and his private life in relation to his family and society and as controlled by his ethics and religion, though it is not possible to draw a distinct line of demarcation between the two. Consequently in understanding politics it becomes necessary to define the relation of political theory to ethics.

In the province of political life the fact of the membership of the State is all important. In the province of life governed by morality membership falls into the background. Ethics is the study of the good or 'well-being' of man so far as it can be realised by the rational activity of man. It lays down some postulates, some propositions of the ultimate good of mankind and an ideal or aim as to 'what should be'. Political theory, therefore, must start from ethics and borrow from it its postulates or ideals, because it not only seeks to explain the working

of the State as it stands, but also what it should be. It must deal with the question, what is the moral aim which men propose to themselves and by what political institutions do they actually or can they ideally realise that aim as members of a political society. Though Politics is a study of men as members of a State in specific relation to political organisation, still the ultimate aim of man as defined in the postulates of ethics must be its chief starting-point for inquiry. For, it is evident that the corporate well-being of the State can only be obtained by the well-being of the individual members who form that State. State without men is inconceivable. The individual well-being of man is indicated by the propositions of Ethics. Of course these propositions may be corrected and improved by argument or experience, but they must nevertheless be regarded as established, because they represent for the time being the principles on which the moral life of man actually proceeds. Thus writers on Politics must ask two questions. Firstly, what are the aims which men propose to themselves as ideals judging from the moral conduct they may see; secondly, by what institutions can they best attain them? Thus a political thinker will start with certain propositions of some ultimate good to mankind, and regarding them as established will prove them by arguments. From these he will deduce a series of propositions and state what complex institutions are conducive to the working, well-being and progress of society, and what political rights he advocates.

Aristotle, for example, in his Politics states that "every State is a community of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good; for, mankind always acts in order to obtain that which they think good." "In all sciences and arts the end is a good, and especially and above all in the highest of all the ultimate aim of mankind is good life—a life in which reason regulates passion, not exterminating it but by reducing it to a mean between its excesses and defects." He regards this proposition as established, because it represents

Aristotle's
ideas.

the principles on which the contemporary Greek life was based. From this he deduces his political institutions. He says that law which is reason without passion will be the Government or Sovereign of the State. Human governors should be the instruments of that law and only its interpreters.

Sidgwick, a modern writer on Politics borrows from Bentham and Mill their utilitarian conception which underlies the politics of the nineteenth century. It is Sidgwick's ideas that the ultimate good of man is the greatest sum of his happiness. His secondary postulate is that each person is the safe custodian of his own happiness, rights and interests. Hence Sidgwick lays down that the end of every political society is the greatest material happiness of the greatest number," and the business of the State is only or mainly to prevent individuals from intruding upon one another beyond what is inevitable or tolerable.

T. H. Green's postulate is that the ultimate good lies in the realisation by each individual of his power of doing and enjoying something worth doing and enjoying so that it may be done and enjoyed. Hence Green's ideas he says that the institution of the State must be adjusted for setting free this power of man for its real and free exercise by the removal of existing obstructions and providing against those that are likely to arise. This discussion will show that Political theory is realised through Ethics. Political Science is really the study of Social Ethics. It has to ask how by corporate action to make best of each other while following the moral aim.

History is intimately connected with political theory and therefore it is necessary to find out the relation between the two. History is the record of its day. The data of political theory are recorded in it. Relation of Political Theory to History Sir John Seely regarded political theory as having for its function inductions from records of history. He believed in didactic history. History was thought "the root" and Political Science "the fruit." But

as a matter of fact Political Science is connected with History because its subject-matter is in the domain of time and differs from time to time. History does not tell us "what ought to be." It can at most tell us that men have been tending to such and such an ideal and that certain institutions by means of which they sought to attain that ideal either helped or hindered their attainment. It cannot say whether that ideal ought to be ours or not, or whether the same ideal will in our case produce the same result as in the past or not? That is the province of Ethics, with which Political Science in its idealistic aspect is connected.

A definition of State is probably impossible. There are many elements which are distinguishable in the full conception of the State. (1) It is an assemblage of human

Elements in
the full conception
of a State.

beings relatively great in number. This assemblage or group must not fall beyond a certain number and it cannot go beyond a

certain number. No political society could possibly maintain either internal or external organisation, unless it was relatively great in number. It must, under existing conditions, be capable of offering some resistance to foreign aggression. (2) There is an element of supreme authority in the State. This authority has an indefinite sphere of action. Limitations upon it exist, but they are incapable of precise enumeration. This authority employs force to compel obedience to its commands and in a developed State all force employed normally and rightly is employed by it and is derived from it. The organised physical force of the community is at the disposition of this authority. (3) A developed State normally acts through law on regular and settled lines; and irregular, arbitrary action has become abnormal both internally and externally. Internally the reign of law is complete, though this cannot be asserted regarding its external life. (4) A State has a certain degree of civilisation. There must be a common stock of moral ideas, for without it permanent internal peace and external relations will be impossible. (5) The State is not a purely artificial contrivance.

It has its life independent of the individuals who compose it. It remains the same though its members may be continually changing its form of Government may alter and its extent of territory may increase or decrease. This becomes of importance when we consider the identity of State. The doctrine of the identity of State is most important in international law, and without it permanent international relations would be impossible. International life starts from the assertion that States are equal and independent and concedes to each State the right to adopt any form of government provided that form is consistent with due performance of its international obligations. The change of Constitution or form of Government cannot relieve a State from antecedent liabilities whether these liabilities arise out of a treaty or otherwise. (6) State and Nationality are not convertible terms. The State is a politically organised body the nation may or may not be politically organised in some one State. In international law any society, *de facto* independent politically and offering reasonable prospects of permanent existence, is accepted that is a State. International law is not concerned with the legitimacy of the State, that is whether the facts of the origin or establishment of its Government are morally defensible or its forms and methods of internal control have any basis in justice or its political ambitions have any foundation on ethical right. Against this doctrine of International Law stands the doctrine of Nationality. Here the principle is that Government must rest on the free opinion of nation and that State is legitimate which gives full effect to the element of nationality. (7) A definite portion of a territory is essential for a State. Of course if a World-State or Universal State is reached, then there can be no question of definite portions of land. (8) There is always a difference in the existing State and the ideal State. Every historical period shows the common attributes of the States actually-existent. On the other hand, the ideal of a perfect form of State has varied from time to time. Actual States have been only approximations to it.

The important problem in the discussions of Political Science is that of Political Sovereignty. Political Sovereignty

Political Sovereignty. It resides in that body of persons which possesses its supreme political power within a community. checks.

In considering where this supreme authority resides, we must first bear in mind that there are two necessary limitations on all governmental actions. Its authority is limited by its own nature. The circumstances of its origin, of its development, the political principle which it represents, all these impose limitations upon its actions, and this, as Professor Dicey terms it, is called the "Internal check." No political authority purely irrational in its actions could conceivably exist for any length of time. Again governmental action is limited by external forces. It is obvious that no Government can go beyond certain limits in certain directions without meeting resistance and without ultimately, if its action is persisted in, being met by successful resistance. The fear of exciting such resistance necessarily influences the action of every Government. The resistance at first may be simply passive, may simply take the form of withdrawal of active assistance or co-operation; but if the Government action is driven home, then the question will become purely one of the balance of physical forces. Lewis however writes in his book on Political Terms that "the word 'Sovereignty' means the supreme power of the person or persons who are sovereign in the State and are legally uncontrolled both from within and without; frequently however it is used in an improper and metaphorical sense to signify the moral influence of a whole or a part of the community upon the acts of the sovereign." The proposition that Political Sovereignty is absolute, can only be true, when the political aspect of man's life is completely separated and isolated from all other forces controlling the actions of human institutions. This is obviously impossible. Control there is. It may not be legal. And in this sense Political Sovereignty is limited and controlled.

CHAPTER VIII

DEMOCRACY AND ITS PROBLEMS

(Now let us see what is Democracy According to Lewis Democracy properly signifies a Government in which a majority of the whole nation or community partakes of the sovereign power. It is also used to signify a Government in which either a majority or a large portion of the people have, by means of the right of election an influence on the appointment of members of the supreme power." Instead of entering however into the discussion of a correct definition of Democracy which has changed historically, let us see the modern conception of an ideal Democracy. It is stated by Abraham Lincoln thus "The Government of the people, by the people, for the people, by all for all." It is for the realisation of this ideal that modern political movements are struggling. Of course in the past there have been serious attempts made to reach the ideal of Democracy which then prevailed. The ideal of modern Democracy, though high, can only be reached through the institution of representative and responsible Government. It differs from the ancient ideal and methods of Democracy, which will be discussed further on.)

It will be readily admitted that the great war has given a fresh impetus to political speculation all over the world. We hear everywhere that Democracy is the best form of Government, and that every political group of peoples has a right to determine its

own form and personnel of Government, and that one race or people should not dominate over another against its will. In India political speculation has been going on long before the war, but a fresh impetus has now been given to it. The new wave of thought consequent on the world-wide conflagration and the change in the political attitude of dominant peoples towards suppressed and subjected nationalities have strengthened, solidified and materialised her political aspirations and demands. India wants and is determined to share in the distribution of new political rights and privileges, and to raise herself to the political level of other nations on the earth. She is struggling to attain this position as far as it lies in her power and as early as she is allowed. The birth of this new assertive and democratic spirit in India is due to many causes. Her material conditions and political circumstances have forced her peoples to think and to find out the best form of Government suited to her future growth. The present Government in India is too much centralised and absolute. Everything is from above. It rules in spite of the voice of the people. This intense centralisation and absolutism, and their attendant attempts to interfere in all the activities of the people and to regulate and control all the affairs of men have compelled the people to turn their attention to the Government, to question its origin of authority, its existing rights and duties and to doubt the utility and advantage of its present form and system. Formerly, India never felt the keenness and intensity of this interference by the Government in her daily life as she does at present. State now wants to control the whole province of man's life. When every religious custom, educational movement, industrial attempt, political aspiration, social activity and individual right and morality are being checked, controlled and guided in a way in which no former Government did or cared to do or dared to do, her people are goaded to leave aside their former lethargy and indifference and to pay attention to the movements, tactics, measures, and the system of control of the Government. This is the main cause of political awakening in India. When

a people find that their powers of local government or autonomy are taken away, their ancient political rights and status in local matters are destroyed, when their opportunities for rising to the highest position in their own land and thus helping to guide its destinies according to national ideals are ruined a process of thought compulsorily arises which finds expression through the mouths of their leaders in an attack on the policy, method and form of the existing Central Government

Then the former faint belief that every ruler is divine and that he has a divine right to rule has completely died out in

India in spite of the attempts of the interested
Decay of
authoritarian
ideas in Politics in
India to keep it up Ruled for the last 700 years by
 foreigners who were alien in race religion
 language and culture and who hated the reli-

gion of the inhabitants despised their race and ridiculed their culture, it was not possible for the people of India to entertain and maintain the sacred and reverential ideas about the divinity of their rulers—a thing which was only possible under the government of the rulers of their own religion and civilisation. Again, the present government being carried on by the servants of an Emperor, who is always an absentee who live thousands of miles away out of the country who himself is limited in his powers by his people and whose promised word is not very often allowed to be fulfilled by his own servants cannot enthral the minds of an Eastern race—a race proud of its high culture and continuous civilisation and equal in ability, intelligence and honesty to the ruling race. Moreover a sincere belief, based on observed facts and conditions of the country, in the gradual deterioration of the character of its people on account of the paralysing presence of a foreign garrison and of the ubiquitous activity of officials, in the degeneration of its initiative and enterprising powers for lack of opportunities, and in the economic exploitation by aliens and in the consequent loss of its productive powers on account of its circumscribed and chained life, has given a filip to political speculation in the country. This political speculation has resulted in the

adoption of the political ideal—"Government of the people, by the people, for the people." In a word, the rule of the people or Democracy has become the goal of the people for their political salvation.

Formerly people thought about religion, started religious controversies, followed intensely religious doctrines and tenets.

Religion sub-ordinated to Politics because religion was the guiding and binding factor in life. It entered and controlled every activity of man including his political rights and duties.

But at present religion has become a personal factor and has fallen from its high pedestal of former glory and power. Political power has now taken that place. It controls all the activities of man including his religious beliefs. Therefore men, who formerly devoted their attention to the study, valuation and purification of religious doctrines and postulates and were the masters of all movements, are now compelled to devote themselves to the study of political theories and ideals, and their application to practical life. Political power has become the sovereign in man's affairs. Religion has lost its former place of sovereignty.

A study of all political theories and an experience of all political organisation recorded in and gathered from history

have led political thinkers and practical politicians to adopt and advocate the democratic form of Government as the best political organisation for carrying on the affairs of State. Though undoubtedly Democracy has many defects and in many cases benevolent despotism has proved superior at certain stages or periods to other forms of Government, still it is found that in a representative form of Democracy only can good and continuous political life be enjoyed. There are writers like Sir Henry Maine who take a different view. But majority are in its favour. Political Science has reached the stage where democracy is approved and where the ways how to organise it for good political life are being suggested and followed.

Approval of Democracy.

Now what is the underlying idea or conception which has made men favour the principle and rule of Democracy?

The Concept History shows that formerly the conception of Demo of the inequality of men was the guiding cracy

principle in the structure of man's social life

That all men are equal is a later conception. Formerly every class, caste, occupation and race had a higher or a lower status in society. A person born in a particular group belonged to the status it had in society. The doctrine that all men are equal was not appreciated. It never guided the activities of society. One's own race or group was the favoured group and its peoples were the messengers and the chosen of the Almighty, who were meant to rule and to enjoy the earth. All others were intended to be their slaves or to be under their permanent control and guidance. They were created to submit and to work for the favoured group. All world around it was barbarous. But this idea of the superiority of one's own group gradually began to give way before the military valour and organisation, the conquests in science, literature and arts of life and Government of other groups. New theories of the equality and fraternity of men began to spread about and to prevail. Structures of societies began to be revolutionised by force of this principle or idea and old and new forces acting on each other began to adjust and transform society and State for the realisation of new and better conceptions. Of course circumstances helped this change in this conception of human nature from the idea of an inequality to that of an equality of men. This new conception underlies the arguments and attempts of those who are spreading democratic spirit in the world. Therefore when the idea that men are equal is being preached and adopted, it naturally follows that one individual, class or race cannot dominate over others without their consent. To rule people against their will and without their help and control is considered a crime against that people and the just principles of political morality. Consequently, a belief and an aspiration arose amongst peoples who were dominated by

aliens that they should themselves determine their own form of Government and the personnel of their rulers, that they should control the political organisation created by them and that they should draw up their own constitution which should be the chief repository of their sovereign power. Administrators and rulers were only to carry out the mandates of the people or the power embodied in the constitution. The ultimate sovereignty was to reside in the people of the country, who were grouped together for political purposes.

That laws are not of the king but of the community, is an ancient idea which had lost its force during the periods of foreign rulers and conquerors. That king is

Relation of the ruler to law and legislator in India not above the law of the community was a well-known principle in practice in ancient or Hindu India, as in the countries of Teutonic races. King only stated law and administered

it. The law was already there. It had only to be interpreted and applied to the needs of the community with the help of its wise men. These wise men, who were considered to be selfless, preserved and represented the highest culture and character of the people. King was also a representative of the people to whom the executive powers of the community were delegated. These wise men were the eyes of the community and had the knowledge, wisdom and ability to state and to interpret correctly the customs and laws, traditions and culture of the community. Law was made by the people, that is, by those who were of the people and in whose ability the people had confidence and faith. King only issued executive orders or ordinances. These wise men were the experts of those times and were considered the proper persons to give their opinions on questions affecting the interests, progress and stability of the community. That the King can do no wrong, that he is above law, that his right to rule is divine and does not arise by consent of the people, were ideas or propositions started by alien conquerors and advocated and adopted by their loyal or interested supporters. In the normal develop-

ment of a community they had no place. They deluded and ruled the minds of men only for some time. But after the lapse of centuries those very conquerors lost the memory and traces of their foreign origin and adopted the ways of the conquered by intermingling. Their former ideas began to lose their force and the people gradually asserted their control over their kings. That religion sanctioned the divine right of kings to rule was a fiction started and interpolated in religious treatises of authority by the priests and favourites of conquerors, who were interested in the permanence of foreign rule. They gave it a place in religious tenets and wove a mythology history and religious philosophy round it in order to give it a plausible form of religious authority with a view to delude the ignorant and credulous and to win over the weak and timorous. The ancient idea was that the kings or rulers must be of the people for the people, and chosen and approved by the people. This is the ruling principle in modern political thought. It is the greatest triumph of modern thought to have again brought to the forefront in a vigorous form this valuable democratic principle, which should guide the formation and working of all political organisations and the development of all peoples and nations in their future political growth.

The question is, who is to guard the moral order in the community? And the answer of modern political philosophers and statesmen is that the voice of the community should have the sole authority in the regulation of man's affairs. Rulers or Governments should be only its agents and administrators. The sovereign must be the people. Every student of politics knows that in a State there must be an absolute power beyond which there is no appeal and there must be some definitely constituted body in which this sovereign power must be represented. This sovereign power is not apart from the community. It can have no right against the community. It only represents and guards the rights and interests of the community. It is community itself given a definite and manageable form and or-

ganisation to execute its will and authority. Though it may be in the hands of a minority, that minority represents the people, is elected by the people and is removable by the people. It has no rights of its own. It exists for the majority, is born of it and embodies it. It governs only because it is backed and approved by majority.

(We find that writers often make a mistake in not differentiating between ancient and modern Democracy. They are quite different. (There was no representation in ancient Democracy. } Direct assemblies of all free citizens was its principal device. } All people took a direct part in it. Modern Democracy lays much stress on representation. Its device is of a representative body chosen by all those who are enfranchised and therefore vote. Ancient Democracy was an oligarchy where free people alone counted politically as members of State. Others, though they were in a majority, had no political status or vote in public affairs. They were outside the pale of politics. Though Aristotle described this ancient organisation as an "Unmixed Democracy," the facts show that it was an assembly of a few free people. Ancient States were small city-states, and hence their life was more intense and direct. Their art of politics was crude. Lots were drawn for offices of magistrates and law-courts. The underlying idea was that anybody could do anything. The all-embracing aim of the ancient State tried to cover the whole life of an individual. It was thought that nothing ought to be outside the State's province. There was hardly a distinction—of course in many cases any necessity of distinction—between central and local powers on account of its smallness. The Roman State, however, did make that distinction to a certain extent on account of its growth and acquisition of large provinces. Ancient State was self-sufficient. Its function was to provide for all its citizens all the necessities for their material life and for all moral life and existence. The whole of man's being and meaning was considered to be contained in the membership of State and

Ancient and
Modern Democ-
racies distin-
guished.

he had no being and meaning apart from it. To the ancient, State was another word for society and it included and organised all social and political activities of men. State was the whole society organised and there was no society besides State. Collective personality of the State was more important than the individual personality of man. An individual justified his existence by the discharge of his function as member of State.)

(Before we discuss the organisation of Modern Democracy, let us see the different forms which historical States have assumed.

First came the City state. It had a limited extent of territory—a city and some surrounding extent of land. It possessed immediate self government by citizens themselves and not through representatives. It had a slave population which was outside the pale of political life, but which was necessary for the performance of its various needs and services. There was no organised and independent priesthood—a fact which left government a free hand for interfering in the conduct and behaviour of its citizens, and regulating their manners, marriages and other rites. In fact, priests were officers of State looking after matters of religion, such as preservation and repair of temples and shrines, and performance of public sacrifices. Next arose the Universal empire State. It was more limited in its scope and less intense and interfering. But it was great in extent. The slave-basis of the City state was disappearing and leading to natural equality of man. State was governed largely from the above. The theory of the Divine Right of Rulers prevailed. Organised priesthood regulated numerous activities of men and rivalled with State in claiming obedience from them. Nation state is the modern State. Its extent is less. It however, has gained in scope of action. Political life is more intense and thoughtful. There is a gradually increasing process towards control of government from below through representatives of people. As the citizens are too numerous to meet in direct assemblies, representation has come to be devised. They were too numerous to be governed from one centre and there-

fore local self-governing assemblies on representative principle had to be established.

But through all these stages the fundamentals of State are always the same, namely, association and the reason for association.)

(The main underlying idea of democracy is to recognise every individual as a distinct social and political being, to admit that he is also a potential being and to concede that if given opportunities, he will rise higher in the scale of moral, mental and spiritual evolution. In short, the aim of democracy is to create opportunities for every individual to rise high and to realise himself and his rights and duties by removing the artificial obstacles of a crude society and civilisation, by giving every sort of help and encouragement to his best natural impulses and intelligence, and by discouraging the growth of hereditary aberrations and eradicating inborn abnormalities. The attempt is to demonstrate that the individual is ultimately supreme and that society in which he is found, is only an instrument for his welfare and progress. This is the chief reason why in modern times Democracy has found favour with right-minded statesmen and political thinkers. The great problem before them is the organisation of Democracy. How the will of the people is to be given utterance and effect to? What devices has modern Democracy followed in practice or thought of in theory? In short, how the people are to be organised into sovereign political bodies so that they may be able to carry out their will by controlling the legislative, judicial and executive forces and actions of their group-life?

CHAPTER IX

THE ORGANISATION OF DEMOCRACY

REPRESENTATION is one of the ways in which the effective organisation of modern Democracy is attempted. It is the most important device and the structure of all institutions or associations invented and established to satisfy the needs or aspirations of modern Democracy is based upon it. If this 'cracy' is to succeed, it must do so through the proper application of the representative principle. Representation is not a new idea. Its application is new in the sense that it is applied in almost all democratic organisations on a wider basis. It was understood and applied in some forms of social and political organisations in ancient times. Though the primitive notion of a law making body was that all members should be present in person, still the history of local or village government in ancient India shows the application of the true idea of representation. But its importance has been realised and its development has taken place in modern times in the organisation of the best form of a government of State.

In a representative government two objects are kept in view, the first is that the Government is to be made responsible to the people and the other is that it should express the will of the people who are sovereign. Of course kings and nobles are just as much a part of the people in the widest sense of the term as other common individuals are. They are certainly an integral part of the nation. In a very wide but loose sense they are representatives, but their representation is limited, indirect, individual and not affirmed by all the people freely,

and hence a pure mockery. They do not represent the vast number of conflicting interests, often act adversely to the interests of the people and ruin their future. But under the modern form of representation which is direct, methodical, and communal, interests of various groups are properly balanced, adjusted and developed, and thus secured as far as practicable.

Ten Questions discussed In adopting as a device the principle of representation it becomes necessary to discuss the following questions :—

1. Ought all to vote? If so, on what system?
2. Ought all to vote equally?
3. Is majority alone to be represented and to decide, or are minorities to have proportional representation in the legislative chamber?
4. Is representation to be one of interests, or of individuals, or of communities, or of territorial units?
5. What should be the qualifications of voters?
6. Ought the voters to control the representatives whom they elect, and what should be their mutual relations?
7. Is the " interest of all " the " interest of the whole " ? If not, how the " interest of the whole " is to be secured?
8. What should be the qualifications of the candidates who stand as representatives at the time of elections?
9. At what intervals elections of representatives should take place, so that they should correctly represent the public opinion?
10. Is the representative to express his own opinion, or that of his constituency, or that of the whole nation? Or what latitude is to be allowed for him as a representative in the assembly where he is to vote?

The proper application of the *representative principle* to any society depends upon the satisfactory solution of these and similar questions. In dealing with different states of societies and different sorts of peoples the answer will not be the same. We, therefore, intend to discuss them here generally by stating some main arguments for and against them as briefly as we can. The opinions of different writers on these questions will vary according to their knowledge and experience and because of the varying character and education of their material namely man and his society. Though the material namely man is fixed the qualities which constitute him are not fixed as well as the numerous relations in which he enters and the varying conditions in which he is found.

✓ Having accepted the underlying principles of Democracy and also that it has a purpose, it follows that every person should be given a right to vote. He knows what is good for him and he must be given an opportunity to guard it. He must have a voice in declaring who is to represent his wishes properly. By granting a vote an interest in public affairs is sought to be created for him, so that he may get some sort of political education inasmuch as he is made a sharer in them. The result is that he begins to feel that his interest is bound up with that of his society. Moreover, his intellectual range is broadened by being trained to think of large and complex problems and thus he becomes an active member of State.

Both the Individualists and the Socialists are the advocates of the system of universal suffrage. They claim democracy as their own political creed. Individualists argue from their two main propositions, namely, the greatest happiness of the greatest number "and" that each man is best capable of judging his own interests," and therefore they believe that all should be represented and have a right to vote. Socialists' argument is that the good of the whole will be best secured by the

Man's competency

rule of the whole. Thus they also support the cause of Universal Suffrage. Mill contends that this is necessary for the protection of the individual. Unless the individual has some political power, he runs at least the danger of his interest being ignored. Political power is given not in order that he may exercise his authority over others, but in order that he may guard himself. It also makes for the progressive development of the individual, and establishes him as a political unit. Thus such a system of Universal Suffrage will result in the elected representatives forming an assembly which shall represent adequately the balance of opinion in the electorate. It would give great strength and solidarity to the state in making all feel interested in its working. All measures will require their approval and assent. No executive government can propose, much less pass, any measure in the teeth of their opposition.

Those who attack this mode of universal suffrage, contend that every man is not capable of understanding his own interest,

and hence cannot guard himself. He is
 Man's incompetency. generally apathetic or indifferent and does not
 come or care to vote, much less does he

understand the interest of the whole. His ignorance and his inexperience make him a narrow and a family man, a communal or a local man. He lives in class-views and local interests. He often, why, generally, acts on impulses and sentimental considerations. He has no foresight and cannot think out permanent gains. His poverty or his greed oftentimes makes him sell his vote to the highest bidder, irrespective of his own higher welfare or that of his society. He will not necessarily welcome and vote for the best man as his representative. His weight would generally be thrown on the side of conservatism and the stability of existing institutions and policy. His ideas would be confined to a stationary society. He would not listen to proposals of liberalism and progress, or allow initiating experiments for improvements which he has not the intelligence to understand. Further, they say that, the art of Government is becoming more and more complex. Its

conduct requires wider knowledge and experience. Any piece of legislation has to be based on a proper realisation of social and economic foundations. It is thus becoming a province of experts. It is approaching the Hindu method and ideas of government that is a government carried on by a king or president according to the law laid down by experts and interpreted by them and according to some customs and conventions enjoined by the people. The experts must be the disinterested the selfless leaders of society. In them the society has faith on account of their integrity of character simplicity of habits self denial regard for the preservation and welfare of the society and its culture and wide knowledge and fore sight. All these qualities cannot be expected to be found in each individual voter. He cannot rise above a certain mediocre position. His presence and influence in the national legislative assembly would lead to a dead level of uniformity or sometimes to a retrogression. His numerical strength would swamp and may often crush individual greatness. This is in short the position of those who are against the system.

If it is our intention to awaken the potentialities of the individual and thus raise him and his society it cannot be done without giving him opportunities of self-development. His preliminary attempts may lead to failures. But they are necessary for the growth of any society. It is with the help of experience gained in individual failures that a society would properly establish itself on the road to progress. Keeping most of the people merely silent spectators or sufferers under a dominating system of government without allowing them to take any part in it would not train them for self government and self-advance. Not allowing them to co operate and participate in public affairs would leave them weak and helpless, and not make them vigorous and resourceful. Their artificial prosperity and propped up stability would be a temporary affair, and would disappear under changed conditions or even a casual upheaval. When we consider man as an ever-developing entity, he must be

given opportunities for training himself, for awakening himself from lethargy and mental and moral stupor as early as possible, so that he may rise as an equal with the other advanced members of his society. There would be no such complete divorce or difference between members of the same political unit. His mistakes or failures may affect the progress of his society to a certain extent, but his ignorance and want of ability would kill the springs of society and make it stagnant and lifeless for want of a fresh impetus. Such a condition of affairs is more dangerous and therefore to be avoided.

The next question is, ought all to vote equally? Are ignorance and knowledge, tax-absorbing poverty and tax-paying property, impatient youth and experienced age, to have the same number of votes? Are educated persons, propertied individuals, and men who have successfully served the State in a number of important matters, to be given more votes than others? Certainly they should be. Ignorance and knowledge should not have the same number of votes. The advancing but complex civilisation needs the help of knowledge. A premium must, therefore, be put on it so as to act as an incentive to the lingering and lagging-behind humanity. Poverty is strong in numbers, but generally indolent and inactive in deeds. Propertied persons are few but active, inventive and resourceful and therefore require encouragement. The poor being in a majority may try to lay greater burdens on the rich and thus ruin them. Therefore in the matter of votes men of initiative and enterprise, who make the greatness of a State, should be given more votes as a reward for them. Men who are great inventors, who have helped the society by their individual deeds in science and art to advance with great strides in culture and civilisation and who have rendered very important services for its stability and progress, should certainly be given more votes than the ordinary eat-and-live sort of dependent humanity filling every hut and hovel. (It will serve as an allurements for those who require it. Plural voting based on such considerations is a necessity.

We must have the best possible men and must therefore give them encouragement. We also want others to follow in their footsteps and therefore we want to put incentives before them. Thus the best though in a minority will not be overpowered, outvoted or discouraged in their endeavours for the uplift of the whole society. In this system of plural voting the number of votes to be given will depend upon each individual case and therefore need not be discussed here. But modern political communities do not adopt this view but that of one individual / one vote.

Our third question is about the position of minorities and their representation. The representation and the rule of the

Q u e s t i o n majority alone in the assembly would be
No 3 **R e p r e s e n** tyranny. The views of minorities would not
tation of **Minor** be represented. Sometimes they may be more
ties

correct and would modify for better the views of the majority if they are allowed a representation in the assembly. The rule of the majority should not mean the entire exclusion of minorities from all participation in the political life of their country. Again the classification into majority and minority is not rigid and permanent. Different questions and problems of importance unsettle previous groupings of people in a State. An interchange of members follows and the relative strength of the majority and minorities rises or falls down. A majority on a particular question, unless voters are completely bound down by party or religious organisations will often be reduced to a minority on some other question and so on. Therefore the view of all persons or groups of persons in a State should be represented in the legislative assembly. In every State particular classes and local interests need protection and unless their position is recognised by giving them a voice in the national assembly, they will lose their importance and would be left disregarded and uncared for. The rule of the majority would often mean the rule of the poor and the ignorant only. They would guard their own interests at the cost of others, who really constitute the best element in the State and are its

the superfluous first-preference votes of the elected candidate are given to the candidate who is given a second-preference on the same voting paper and so on, till all the necessary members are elected.

The third one is that under which two separate kinds of votes are given: the first is Party Voting, and the other is Party Voting Voting for particular candidates. Each voter votes generally for the whole party list drawn up by his party giving as many votes as there are places to be filled, and he also names the particular man or men on the list whom he prefers. Each party then gets a number of seats proportional to the number of votes cast for its men. The individual candidates get seats according to the number of votes they secure.†

Our fourth question is about the representation of individuals or interests. It is already discussed partly in the preceding question. To-day, it is practically

the representation of individuals which is the recognised form. The tendency is towards equality in voting power between individuals and so far as is possible, a numerical equality

between constituencies. In its simplest form the local area of the country comprising the total electorate is divided into constituencies in proportion to the density of the population. But the objections formulated against single-membered constituencies are stated above and need not be repeated here.† The problem of functional or occupational representation is occupying pluralistic thinkers. It is however too complex to be stated here. It wants to organise society and state by giving representation to functional groups on a territorial basis.

The fifth question is about the qualifications of voters. The present tendency is to give every sane adult a vote, unless he is disqualified on account of some crime against the State endangering its stability and peaceful progress, in which case he does not belong to the State as he defies it. In such

Question
No. 4: Represen-
tation of indivi-
duals or groups.

Question
No. 5: Qualifica-
tions of Voters.

a case he is a stateless man and the State cannot extend its membership to him by giving him a vote. Any other disqualifications which may be introduced will depend upon the needs of each people. They should be introduced only to protect the existence of a State and not its forms. To adopt any special qualifications and to attach them to every voter would be against the principle of universal suffrage recognised by democracy and therefore they need not be discussed here. They are generally based on age possession of property payment of taxes education and holding of some distinction, office, profession or titles. All a position however as regards this question is a little different. He observes. Representative institutions are of little value and may be a mere instrument of tyranny or intrigue when the generality of electors is not sufficiently interested in their own government to give their votes, or if they vote at all do not bestow their suffrages on public grounds but sell them for money or vote at the back of some one who has control over them, or whom for private reasons they desire to propitiate. Popular election as has practised, instead of becoming a security against misgovernment, is but an additional wheel in its machinery. From this it is clear that he was not in favour of any attempt to apply the method of representation to every people. But modern democracy is against this view. Introduce any compatible checks, but give every sane and adult person a voice in public affairs by giving him or her a vote in the electorate. It is advisable to put checks, because there is a tendency of self interest and a possibility of obscurantism in a system of suffrage advocated above. The Government of all is not taken by itself for all. It should be combined with a sort of selfless and intelligent aristocracy not in the hereditary sense, so that the mixture will tend to check self-interest and will help to supply the deficiency of knowledge and new things.

How far voters should control their representatives and whose opinion an elected member is to express—these are our

sixth and tenth questions. A representative, to retain his character and to fulfil his function of a representative, should be controlled so that he will not have any liberty to misrepresent or oppose the opinion of his constituency.

Questions
Nos. 6 and 10:
Is a representative
a delegate or
a trustee?

Every candidate at the time of election should be made to state what his general ideas and principles are, regarding questions which are or are likely to come before the country, and also those which particularly affect his constituency; and also what policy and modes of work he is going to follow, if elected. After he is elected and when he sits as a member, he should be made to declare before his constituency what particular acts and measures as they come up for discussion and vote he means to support or oppose and on what grounds. Of course in modern days political parties and other political organisations do the work of choosing proper candidates and get them elected on behalf of those who belong to their own parties, and after their election watch their career as representatives.

A representative is always nowadays a member of some organisation or party and depends for his seat on the help of his party machinery. Unless he joins any party, he has very little chance of being elected. He cannot do his work as thoroughly and satisfactorily as he should without the

Party system
and the repre-
sentative.

help of his party organisation. It gives all sorts of information and support which is necessary for his success as a representative. In fact he is the mouthpiece of his party, and the party organisation is his advisory, executive and controlling committee. By the help of a party organisation the work of representatives from different parts of the country is co-ordinated and solidified and becomes effectual. It is the electorate's watchguard over a representative. Its press give publicity to all his acts, speeches and votes so that those whom he represents, are able to judge of his career, and consequently he in turn also feels to that extent his responsibility. Parties have become links between electorates and governing bodies

and affect their mutual relations in a variety of ways producing harmony or apathy between them according to their policy on different occasions. A representative has therefore to be loyal not only to his local constituency but also to his national party. Though they are not necessarily conflicting in their views some times an antagonism between local interests and party interests is likely to rise and local interests often neglected in the interests of party politics. A representative is likely to plead that he represents a party and not a locality. Thus often the result is that a party strengthens members against constituencies. The members find that they can follow the policy of a party and neglect the instructions or mandates of their constituencies without necessarily losing their seats. Thus a party tends to make them creatures of the party whip. Constituency voters are generally bound to and follow one party or another and cannot go against the programme of their party. Thus we see that a party modifies a pure or delegative democracy in controlling it, and in making it more national than local which it is apt to be. Burke defined a party as 'a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principle on which they all agree'. The work and advantages of a party system are that it must have a programme teach it to the nation increase its followers and realise it by concerted action. In having its own organisation and discipline it initiates its followers into political work maintains harmony between the executive and the legislative bodies of a nation. It acts as an excellent and efficient critic on the executive. In a nation in which party divisions are artificial, running right down through the people dividing the rich and the poor on both sides, and do not coincide with class stratifications they generally prevent economic strifes. Horizontal divisions create social hatred and disputes. There are defects also in party organisations and if a country is divided into a number of parties, they become numerous.

A representative may act in two ways. He may remain an agent, a delegate acting under a mandate from his consti-

tuency the terms of which he has to follow ; or he may act as a trustee entrusted with the power of exercising a will of his own, and possessed with a discretionary authority and responsible for his general conduct but not responsible for each individual act to his electors, he is not bound to follow what may for the time being be the general opinion of his constituents. If the object of the institution be that the will of the people, that is, of the majority exercising political rights at any particular moment be as nearly as possible carried into effect, then the representative must be a delegate and the more closely he follows the mandates given him and the more frequently mandates are issued to him, the more perfect will be the working of the system.

In discussing these questions it is necessary to bear in mind that every representative is allowed and must have some freedom. He cannot be made only a transmitting agency. He is no doubt a mediating agency. A constituency elects him because it has faith in his representation. He possesses some qualities and qualifications which are his testimonials for election. Therefore when a representative is elected, he is elected not only to represent the opinions of his electorate but also to express his own views on difficult and far-reaching questions of public importance—to assert which he is deputed by his voters. They would rather prefer his opinions on such matters than their own which are generally ill-informed and not studied ones. He has a greater power of understanding complicated issues of national importance, and this they believe and know. He is thus elected in a two-fold capacity. Firstly, he is to represent and guard local interests in accordance with local desires, using his discretion and judgment in matters of details for the welfare of the locality. His other capacity would be to represent local views on matters of national importance exercising generally his full discretion. The very fact that he is elected by a locality, shows that it has full confidence in his ability and sound judgment. He is to do this work without any unnecessary check, because it has not the necessary time

and ability to do it. His thoughts and feelings, his methods of work, his industry and interest in public affairs, his devotion to their well being, his intelligence and knowledge are all widely known amongst his electors. They consider him to be more capable and serviceable than others and hence his fitness as a representative.

There are various difficulties in answering these questions as we approach different societies and politics and their particular structures. They contain many problems and give rise to a number of interesting points.]

Now we shall deal with the seventh question. The interests of all are not necessarily the interest of the whole. All means a sum of units or the collective whole. By

Question each man's seeking and knowing his own interests [the interests of all units may be secured, No 7. Is the sum of the interests of all the interests of the whole? or there may result a conflict marring their interests altogether?] The interest of each man, irrespective of that of the whole, does not

necessarily coincide with and may often go against that of the whole. It may be the interest of each or all to betray the State at a particular moment or period but it is certainly not in the interest of the whole to be thus betrayed and ruined. In the Marāthā history the interests of Raghoba and Bājirāo II did not mean the interests of the Marāthā Daulat or Rājya. Every student of history knows this. Democracy will be successful if the interests of all become the interest of the whole. (If every individual cares only for his livelihood, becomes a self centred being and pursues his own interest, can it be said that his own interest will be secured?) One would say, certainly not and much less that of the whole. The interest of "the whole" is not included in the interest of "all". It is more and also separate. The whole has its own existence, identity and potential growth. (Its composing units are continually changing individually. Its future interests cannot be protected by each seeking his own interest in the present time.

Therefore for any people to seek after the interest of the collective whole, they must have already attained a habit of considering the interest of the whole, that is, Society or State, and also a habit of loyalty to it. To be trusted to know what that interest of the whole is, a certain level of education or power of thinking is also necessary.)

We have now to discuss the qualifications of members. It is our eighth question. Every member must have sufficient ability to understand how best to perform the work of a representative. Problems of various importance and complexity, (he must be able to study and value, and to form his own opinions about them as to how they affect the country and the interests of his locality.) Therefore an educational qualification of a sufficiently higher type becomes necessary in order that the representative may not fall a victim to the misrepresentations and allurements of the better-organised and powerful interests and cliques in the assembly, saying ditto to all what they dictate.) The great majority of the represented have neither time, nor opportunity, nor education, nor wish to form opinions on far-reaching questions like education or foreign policy. A candidate must be willing to stand. He must be competent to undertake the work and responsibility of his position. Incorruptibility must be his essential virtue in order that both the interests of the represented and of the nation as a whole may not be betrayed; he should be a faithful exponent of the national will, must be able to understand the interests of the whole in order that he may be entrusted with the power of determining it. Industry, and desire for public work, steadiness and strength of will in holding to them under adverse and tempting circumstances are qualities generally expected of him. (Qualifications about age, sex, property or tax, and other communal or residential qualifications depend upon and will vary in each and every case according to the stage to which any particular society has reached.) Treason against the State will be a disqualification.

Q u e s t i o n
No 8. Qualifica-
tions of members.

Modern party organisations try to secure proper candidates and to get them elected. Branches of these party organisations are spread all over the country. Every locality has its party-club or union which looks after its party interests, and chooses and puts forth its proper candidates and works for their success in election. Being interested in the election of its own men and being devoted to its cause it does its work very zealously. Ignorance of voters who either vote blindly or according to some minor local questions which they understand is thus counteracted in elections of representatives who are to deal with national and imperial or federal affairs.

(At what intervals elections should take place is our remaining question. In order that the represented should have control over their representatives it becomes

Q u e s t i o n
No 9 Intervals
of elections necessary to limit the period of representation of members. Voters continually change. Their views are not necessarily constant.

Problems which affect them are often not the same. Questions of extreme importance suddenly confront them. The elected cannot always be trusted to be what they ought to be. All these varying factors necessitate a new election and a new assembly at some short intervals so as to make the assembly really representative and able to express the national will and so as to put fresh vigour into the work and watch of the body.

Modern countries resort to new general elections at intervals of every three to five years. The represented have thus an opportunity to revise their choice of candidates, and their mandates or instructions at these intervals so as to make their representation a reality.

It is a custom or convention of modern constitution not to observe often these rules of definite period elections but either to shorten or prolong that period if matters of very great national importance arise. It is necessary to adjust the constitutional machinery in this way in order to meet the exigencies of the collective whole and not to endanger its safety in times

of danger. Writers have also suggested that it would be a useful device if assemblies are dissolved and re-elected and the country's mandate and vote secured for the party or principle it supports at a fresh election for the passing of every new and important measure. Thus those who have succeeded in elections by misrepresentations and become mere puppets in the hands of a secret organisation will receive a direct check from the electorate.)

CHAPTER X

THE ORGANISATION OF PUBLIC OPINION

THUS far we have dealt with the device of Representation and some important questions which arise in connection with it. It is the most important device which modern democracy has accepted to make its programme successful. It is adopted in all countries where the idea that people must have some share in the government of their country and in the determination of their welfare has been fully accepted.

There are other devices which are suggested to obviate the difficulties that arise in a system of Representative Govern-

ment and to make the public opinion real, Autonomous Minorities and local groups to Majority rule is its chief mark, and therefore the despotism of the majority has to be avoided. Majorities do not necessarily possess

divine right to rule. Therefore the power of the State if exercised always according to the will of the majorities, may on many occasions do harm to progressive and vigorous minorities and the principles for which they are striving. In large States the remoteness of the seat of a Central Government results in the neglect of local interests and progress. There only a few persons have any direct interest or knowledge in a great number of questions, and yet those who have no knowledge or interests, have an equal voice with others in the settlement of such questions. In dependent polities it is the foreign vote that shapes and determines the policy and fate of all matters notwithstanding any pseudo system of Representative Government that may have been introduced. When representatives have no direct interest, they are generally, influenced by selfish

interest, envy and love of power in questions which are vital to others. Thus the grant of autonomy to subordinate nations and cultural groups, whose very existence and progress depends on it, is very often opposed by them. In such and other matters they show extraordinary reluctance to exercise any reasonable or humane considerations. It is therefore very dangerous to allow the governing body to determine matters which concern only a small section or group, whether it be geographical or industrial or defined in any other way. The best remedy for this evil lies in allowing autonomy to every important group in all matters that affect that group much more than they affect the rest.' The government of a group chosen by that group will be far more in touch with its constituents, far more conscious of their interests than a remote Imperial Parliament nominally representing the whole structure of groups and their interests.' Therefore in matters which concern a group vitally there should be self-determination. All different groups should be controlled by a neutral authority chosen by all to adjust their conflicting interests amicably. This kind of federalism in a system of Representative Government is necessary as a supplementary device for the successful working of democratic ideas. Thus a centralised government can be made less oppressive and interfering by a system of devolution of power and work on a basis of territorial, communal or cultural groups. In this way the influence of people ignorant of matters not directly affecting them will be minimised and men will be no longer forced to submit to their decisions.

* People must be made to take interest in their own affairs. Otherwise they will stagnate politically as well as socially. For this they must have power in the shape of autonomy. A top-heavy system of central authority curbing and directing all movements of every group and locality does not create bases of self-confidence, enterprise and initiative in the units of an organism which are necessary for the stability and further progress of the whole. Every individual must have a training ground for public work. Centres of activity must be created

for the rise of experienced public men for the service of the whole organism in its times of need and crisis as in ordinary times. For this all that is good in the individual must be developed and realised and opportunities must be created and maintained for his free growth.

A new method of direct representation of the people is the device known as Referendum. Its advocates contend that every important measure should be placed before the country and a vote of every citizen should be taken on it. This idea of Referendum seems to have originated in the distrust felt by voters against their representatives. It is true that all representatives may not be distrusted. But generally the representatives are rich and belong to the upper classes. Therefore when important matters are submitted for their consideration and approval they do not necessarily command popular trust and consent. By this method of Referendum modern democracy wants to guard itself against its betrayal by its own representatives.

In mediæval times in Europe representatives were not entrusted with full powers of representation on all matters on behalf of their principals. They were not empowered to treat or to conclude finally. They were to listen to and discuss the proposals put before them and then refer them back to those who sent them. This was in vogue in Germany and some cantons of Switzerland.

At present in Switzerland Referendum is used as a reference to the people for a final decision concerning a change in the Laws or Constitution. It is now established by law that the people of every canton of the Confederation have a right to have all important legislation referred to them for confirmation or rejection. Thus by referring occasionally important matters to the votes of the people the supremacy and sovereignty of the will of the people are recognised and maintained in practice. The whole body of voters as such is roused by this method to a sense

of their own direct responsibility. They get a direct representation and determining voice in the government of their country. They become conscious politically and socially. The whole people become the legislative assembly. No intermediaries intervene.

Referendum in a State may be called into existence in two ways. One is 'optional' and the other 'obligatory.' If a certain number of voters demand by a petition that a particular measure should be submitted to the vote of electors, a provision or practice recognising this right is called 'optional' Referendum; if the provision is that every substantial law or change in laws must be submitted to the vote of the electors, it is known as an 'obligatory' Referendum. What matters are to form the subjects of Referendum is to be determined by each political entity. Generally matters relating to constitution, laws and other measures of general application and of great importance will be thus settled.

There are certain defects observable in the working of this system. It often happens that a number of people or even a majority of them do not express their opinion on a measure submitted to or brought before them. Only those who are politically-minded, do so. In such a case submission to the vote of electors is a Referendum in name. Again, representatives are more learned, liberal, experienced and would be assertive of rights and interests, while the people are ignorant, conservative, narrow-minded and would be easily manipulated by wire-pullers and party organisations. Moreover, there would be no general discussion or talk or understanding of one another's points of view and arguments. It would be a vote given by every one irrespective of any idea of compromise, convenience or any joint thinking or deliberation. No sense of responsibility or reasonableness as members of a collective whole would be found amongst the generality of the voters. Then who are to settle the details, if ready-made drafts of general provisions

are submitted to the electorate and if detailed drafts are submitted then how are they to be changed if thought necessary? Under this scheme a measure if disapproved will not become a law. This power is necessarily negative. If any particular measure is thought necessary how to get it enacted? The affirmative or constructive power is evidently absent in the voting electorate. Further the responsibility which a representative feels when on his vote depends the success or failure of any measure would not be felt by him in an equal degree under the system of Referendum. Thus the interest taken by him and consequently his value and efficiency as a representative would be spelt and in some cases disappear.

To give all the political power to a people who are loyal to the State and to make the executive responsible to their vote ought to be the practice of every good and benevolent government even if it is foreign. The fortune and future of vast numbers of human groups cannot be forcibly retained for ever or even for a long time by any human rulers against their will. To liberate all the peoples of the world from foreign despotism and to guard the interests and liberty of all the weak and strong nations from foreign aggression and dominion had been declared to be the aims of the Great War. We all wished that they had become the results of that terrible human upheaval and carnage. That all people should determine their own form of government and live and progress peacefully under it was the main reason why America entered the war. But her mission proved a failure. Politicians moved on the wheels of self interest and aggrandisement.

Direct legislation means the making of laws by the people themselves. The whole of the people or at least the voters should directly take part in the process of legislation. This is the only method of direct democracy. Rousseau regarded it as the only true expression of popular sovereignty. In old Greek city-states and in cer-

Initiative

tain cantons of modern Switzerland direct democracy where all free citizens took or take part in legislation has been followed.

Now in larger states of modern times this is not possible. The sovereignty of the people however is maintained through representative institutions. Initiative and Referendum are the two devices used in representative institutions to give an opportunity to the whole body of citizens in making or approving of the law. Thus a direct vote of the people is sought, and their general will known.

The Initiative means that a legal right is given to the people to present a petition signed by a sufficient number to cause a legislative measure to be brought to a popular vote. Then if the measure is passed by a required majority, it becomes law.

The Recall is a method by which voters of a particular area exercise the right of calling back their representative from his seat in the legislature and of electing another in his place.

Plebiscite, says Leacock, is a vote of the people used merely as an expression of opinion without having any binding force and intended as a guide to the policy of the government.

A political party is a body of citizens who are more or less organised for political purposes as a unit, and who by the use of their voting power wish to control and conduct the government and carry out their general policy and special measures.

There is a close connection between political parties and democracy.

It is a fact that the present atmosphere is of political fight. The religious controversies of the past have receded into the background. The reason is obvious. Formerly it was religion which tried to embrace and control all the activities of man. It claimed the devotion, the obedience of man exclusively.

Other associations were only its instruments subordinated to its authority, and confined in their activities within the limits laid down. Now it is politics which regulates and controls all our activities and lays down the limits of the sphere of other associations. The godless state is our modern god governing us for our good and for the security of our goods.

In this reign of the State the idea of democracy is emphasized. The rule of the people is to be realized through representatives and responsible institutions. Public opinion is to be the guide, the directing force in this organisation of the state. It is the public opinion which is to be represented. It is to the public opinion that the government is to be responsible. Thus the public opinion is to be the criterion according to which our ideas and ideals are to be tested, and accepted.

The public opinion in our days wants 'self determination', but who is to determine the self? The 'will of the people' is to prevail, but who is to find out the will and how?

These are the questions before every democrat. We hear the same cry in our country, and if democratic theories and forms of government must come to prevail in

The problem facing democracy in India, the same question will perplex us and press us for a solution. If the people are ignorant, who is to teach them and to guide them? If they are indifferent, who is to draw them out to discipline them for expressing their will and for taking an intelligent share in their own political affairs? In the beginning this share may be unintelligent and formal, for the sake of others, on behalf of others, only with an idea of not displeasing a friend or a relation—a personal idea, but later on, it may be intelligent and real for their own sake, on behalf of all, with an idea of doing one's duty—a national idea. This work of politically energising the people has to be done in order that individuals may become intelligent and interested, and that they may try to support what good there

is in each issue with which their country and locality are faced.

This is done by political parties. The living problem before them is to attract the votive elector and the non-votive

The function of political parties is not zealous to exercise his rights in election. He has to be roused from his lethargy

and to be made to think before he is brought to the polling-booth, and in order to vote for a party he will also have to be drilled in his opinions. Votes of electors determine the persons who are to represent them. These representatives will then determine the fates of the issues which confront the people. Therefore voters must be willing to vote, and candidates must be willing to stand and to represent the electors, in order to make democracy take its roots, to grow and to give its fruits and flowers. Hence there is a need of expert trainers or organised bodies to make men take interest in political affairs, and make them use their votes for electing candidates at elections, and give those votes to candidates who follow their opinions.

Men are the most difficult material to deal with. Therefore, any organisation or bringing men of the same opinions together without hurting their susceptibilities, without making them feel that their independence is in any way being controlled or curtailed, must be efficient and elastic. Since the rule of the majority is the mark of modern representative governments, every attempt has to be made to get the majority in every constituency and in the country as a whole to vote for a candidate of one's own opinions. Generally, though it is the clever who rule in politics, their power and work have to be backed by a majority of electors. From the point of view of intelligent and interested voters, representatives who are elected must respond to their wishes and be controlled so as not to go against them. Elected candidates also require help and support from their constituencies to do their work well and fearlessly.

Therefore the need of leaders the wishes of electors and the work of representative make party organisations useful if not a necessity. As soon as the sovereignty of the people is recognised and they are given votes to decide who should represent them in the work of government those who want to be their representatives and to conduct the government according to their ideas principles or methods of work, must get support from the majority of voters. To do this in large localities, throughout provinces and over a whole continent like America or India requires a plan an organisation and very strenuous work. This presupposes groups or unions of persons of similar opinions who are ready to unite and to work together in order to enfold all springs of sovereign power flowing from different constituencies.

1. Pure democratic form of government, that is all persons taking part in deliberative functions, is an impossibility in modern states where vast numbers of human beings are organised as one unit for political purposes, where the extent of territory runs up to the dimensions of a continent and where complex problems of an international character, political as well as economic, can only be tackled by experts and experienced men. In a great modern democratic state, the sovereign power always eludes the grasp of its ignorant, indifferent and indolent masters, and plays in the hands of its intelligent, energetic and shrewd administrators. It embraces those who know how to use it.

Thus parties are the moving and linking factors in the modern political life of representative forms of government. They co ordinate the elements of political sovereignty, take counsel together and come to an agreement. They concentrate its power and make it work for their own or their country's good according to their own light and aspirations. Parties have now become a necessity and have come to stay. They have become a part in the life of modern political communities. Public opinion is expressed through them.

Formerly parties were held subversive of order and peace because they opposed the prevailing form of government or its personnel, which was then held to be the permanent seat of sovereign power, and as such was considered sacred and divine in its inception and growth. Under the then prevailing ideas of divine monarchies, heaven-born theocracies, heaven-privileged aristocracies where minorities ruled, there was no place for a people's party. Possessors of power, temporal ministers and religious priests were responsible to no human being. Legislative assemblies, if any, were merely advisory bodies or registering and rectifying councils. That there can be a constitutional opposition to the persons or party in power, is an idea of later growth. It is democracy alone which brought sovereign power from theocratic heaven to democratic earth and recognised the right of minorities as legitimate bodies entitled to criticise and to persuade, and thus to attain to power by becoming the majority. This was the first condition for the success of popular government. The success of party system depended upon it. Though law does not recognise parties as statutory bodies, they help in the formulation of politics, and colour the working of the executive and legislature. The power they acquire by organising and manipulating voters and their votes is immense. Whether they use it for public welfare, or pervert it for selfish and sectarian ends, they do influence and mould the working of democratic government.

But parties which come into existence to guide, to direct and to develop public opinion in order to do its work efficiently or intelligently, give rise to new evils. Complex constitutions of modern times, the heavy work of government in matters legislative, administrative and judicial, and intricate questions to be dealt with by it, lead to the curtailment of the power of the people. Only forms remain. The reality of power in parties passes to professional politicians, rings, and bosses, to those who are rich, ambitious and pushing. Voter's vote becomes voiceless. The enormity of business to be done and

he want of time and men to do it create the necessity of connivance at malpractices and high handedness. The people who rose for a share in political power with a will to vote and to control to guide and to help are again realising their impotence to make their wishes real their wisdom dominant. It seems that small states with lesser problems alone are the fit spheres for the full action of people's control. But if the world wants to unite as a complex political machine where manifold varieties are maintained then it will remain in the hands of the few whatever machinery you may invent to make the people's voice dominant. Great problems require master minds and instantaneous solutions. Unless the world withdraws from war people will not rule and repose in peace.

The Theory of the Separation of Powers implies that the three functions, Legislative Executive and Judicial, of a State should be performed by different bodies of persons and that they should be independent, and supreme within their sphere. This is supposed to lead to a guarantee of individual liberty and the smooth working of a government in the interests of the governed. Formerly power was held by one or few and was not differentiated. There was no division of power, nor its proper inter relation and the possessor of power was responsible to no one for his actions and was limited by no legal restraints. Concentration of power led to tyranny. Distribution of power under proper checks and balances led to individual liberty.

In actual practice, however marked or complete separation of powers is not possible. Each power has discretionary and emergency powers relating to the other two powers.

It was Montesquieu who emphasized this view of the separation of Powers in British Constitution. It was adopted in the U.S.A. and experimented upon in France during the French Revolution. In England there has never been any complete Separation of Powers.

In order to make democracy more real and local, there is a tendency to allot or to devolve power from the top to the subordinate bodies. This delegated power can be withdrawn but is given in order to facilitate work, and to make people take greater interest and responsibility in their local or provincial work.

Devolution.

It was a political maxim for some time that a Legislature should consist of two Houses or Chambers—the Upper and the Lower—in order to protect the interest of higher classes which the Lower Chamber may not consider, and to supply some special skill which the Lower Chamber may not supply. Formerly the Upper Chamber consisted of privileged classes but now they are differently chosen with either qualifications of great state service, or of advanced age, or of education, etc. It is not heredity or appointment but election that constitutes them. In England still only privileged classes enter the House of Lords.

B i c a m e r a l system.

In America the States send representatives to the Senate. In India, persons of higher money qualifications and privileged classes are those who are entitled to sit in the Council of State. The opposite views (regarding the value of Second Chambers) are expressed in the following well-known passages:—

- “A Popular Assembly without a Senate cannot be wise. A Senate without a Popular Assembly will not be honest.”—*Political Aphorisms*, Harrington (1611-77).
- “If a Second Chamber dissents from the first, it is mischievous. If it agrees with it, it is superfluous.”—Abbe Sièyes (1790).

An amendment of a Constitution is done by an ordinary process of legislation as in England, or by an extraordinary process of legislation as in America or France. In England the Parliament which passes ordinary laws also makes changes in Constitutional Laws. In America and France a different proce-

Amendment of a Constitution.

cedure is laid down in the constitution for its amendment. It is a complicated procedure. In America not only a greater majority is necessary but the bodies are not the same. They include both the Federal unit and the State units. In France a joint sitting of both the Houses is required.

CHAPTER XI

WHAT IS GOOD LIFE

IDEAS of good life depend on past traditions, present needs and future ideals. They relate to the three aspects of man's life, namely :—

(1) Material.

(2) Moral, intellectual, emotional, and

(3) Spiritual.

Material aspect deals with bodily needs, moral, intellectual and emotional, with mental vigour and development, and spiritual with soul's peace and salvation.

Material Life. Material life concerns itself with the preservation and development of body. The maintenance of a minimum standard of living is its first necessity. Food, shelter, clothing, leisure, medicine, air and water are its constituent elements which every one must get in all conditions of life. Some amount of conveniences and comforts or recreations is also now considered a necessity and not luxury. Whether a man is old, unemployed, disabled or diseased, or a minor, he must be assured of primary necessities of life, even though he is not able to render any service in return. Moreover, there should be a fair distribution of wealth and material resources of the country amongst its members. A concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and extreme poverty amongst the many lead to misery, dependence, and antagonism between classes. This results in the disturbance of social order and in the misery and helplessness of the poor. Kauṭilya states—*Sukḥasya mūlaṃ dharmah, Dharmasya mūlaṃ arthah* and

Arthamūlan dhannakūman On satisfaction of material life depends good life moral and spiritual *Bubhukṣitaḥ kuṇṇ na karoti pāpaṃ*, that is a starving man will not be afraid of crime or sin In order to live well, one must live

Moral, intellectual and emotional aspects are related to the training and development of the mind heart and social part of

Moral Life man They first concern themselves with the methods and ideals of education which performs this function of creating a healthy mind and an altruistic man Mind is the special characteristic of man Hindu state—*Mana eva manuṣyanam kṛānam bandhainokṣayoh* that is, our mind depend man's bondage and salvation *Sana mens in sano corpore* or Healthy mind in a healthy body, was the idea of the Romans The function of the mind is to think, and of a developed or trained mind is to think rightly to distinguish right from wrong, good from evil etc When it is able to do this then only man's moral life can be improved and emotional life may be beautified On a better type of intellectual life depend the right recognition of true moral ideals and the proper inspiration and activity born of deeper emotion and higher sentiments It is throwing of heart and mind into work that creates higher moral life The high moral ideas of Hindus are based on *Śatva* or purity *Satya* or truth, *Dharma* or duty, *Ahimsā* or tolerance *Tapaḥ* or austerity *Samatva* or equality and four *Puruṣārthas* A correct appreciation and application of these ideas on different occasions are the work of a good man The ideal of liberty order equality fraternity, unity nationalism cosmopolitanism and democracy are the ideals preached and practised by Western people, as the ideals of good life

Spiritual aspect concerns itself with soul's activities ends and development It lays down spiritual discipline and

Spiritual Life deterrents necessary for the soul's evolution The place of the soul in the environment its character or reality its course of evolution its importance in worldly material life its claims on body and society its rela

tion to and emanation from God, are some of the questions determined in discussing and laying down the good conditions, or fundamentals of spiritual life. Hindus characterised the aim of spiritual life as Mokṣa or salvation, its path as that of Pravṛtti or attachment, Nivṛtti or detachment and Sanyāsa and Yoga, that is, renunciation, and union as its method. The ultimate good life or reality is this spiritual life which aims at the final liberation of man from Saṃsāra or constant worldly existence.

“ MAN PARTLY IS AND WHOLLY HOPES TO BE ”

Good life is possible if the ideals inspiring a society or state are good. Not only the form or structure of a society should be of the approved type but its ideals must be of the highest kind. Then only a good citizen can exist or appear. What is good life and what are best social or political ideals? These questions are not easy and few are agreed about them.

It is generally admitted that good life means a virtuous and industrious life, and a life of public spirit, service and good will. Hindus described good life as the life of the Sat or good, and of the Udāra-carita or noble, of Parārtha (other's welfare), and Parahita (other's good). They also emphasized a life of work or Prayatna and not of idleness or Daiva or Ālasya. They kept two aims before them, one of Abhyudaya, the other of Niḥśreyasa, that is, prosperity here, and peace hereafter. This could be attained by following four purposes or Puruṣārthas and by organising life into four Varnas and four Āśramas. The first laid down the ends and their relative importance, and the other, the organisation or structure of personal and social life. The old aristocratic ideals of a noble or a philosopher or a finely developed personality, and of an upper, virtuous, leisured, and wise class are not now much to the forefront of public opinion.

The organisation of modern societies is based on democratic principles and the modern ideals on the ideas of equality liberty, fraternity and justice. All these ideals and organisation must lead to the happiness of all or at least to the greatest happiness of the greatest number as the Utilitarians put it.

Two conditions. For the well being of society two conditions are necessary —

(1) *Order*

(2) *Opportunity for progress and reform*

Order can be preserved by mutual respect and tolerance. Its aim is to maintain what exists and to lay down conditions of peace so that existence and progress may be peacefully possible. Without order no society can enjoy what good it has gained, or experience what a particular type of life means, or even can progress because progress is possible from conditions existing and definite. Progress itself means realisation of particular ideas or state of society. When achieved progress contemplates order, and order when established thinks of and leads to progress. Order is a basis for and creates opportunity for progress and reform.

Order requires obedience to laws of the country and conventions and customs of society. But if it were to mean obedience to any lawless laws or conscienceless customs it would be no order but tyranny on one side and slavery on the other. Order implies conditions of progress or reform and therefore freedom is one of the essential characteristics of good order and progress. Without freedom man or society cannot move from worn out forms and ill suited or retrograde bonds. Both the rational man and the emotional man could express and aspire under conditions of freedom, and order. Equally important with freedom is education which prepares man for new ideas of order and progress. Unless man is mentally responsive to and receptive of these, the value of order and progress cannot be realised.

Education prepares the mind, and circumstances compel it to approve of and follow new ideals.

Ideals are creations or aspirations of great men meant as an end of society and to change the existing order of institutions and conceptions. They may become embodied in ideal kings, institutions, or sages, or be inculcated through abstract principles or teachings. They serve to mould the existing frame and ends of society by process of reform or revolution. The old Hindu conceptions of a good king or Rājarsi, of the Varṇāśrama system, and the conceptions of Vedānta have been continually moulding the existing Hindu society in order to lead it to a higher state of individual and social existence. The best and the efficient man, the harmonious and the efficient society, must be the aims for which ideals should strive.

Liberty was the guiding conception of Greek political life. It meant not only freedom from foreign rule, but within the country a right to share in the government, to equality before the laws and proper justice. Government was not to be a bondage or tyranny. It rested on the consent of and actual participation by the governed. It also meant to the Greeks a life of leisure and creation in other walks of intellectual and æsthetic life, social tastes and pleasure.

In modern times liberty involves the ideas of civil, political, national and religious liberty, wherein certain elementary rights or conditions of life are guaranteed to every individual. Government is not considered all in all. It is not above law but must act according to law and is only an instrument of human welfare. Liberty involves the idea that man has got something good or pure within and should therefore be given liberty to associate himself with all aspects and activities of life and thus to progress along with his society. It also presupposes that there is something evil or ignorant within him which requires control in the interests of the very liberty itself. The real limitation is to be found in the idea of a common good which he is not allowed to destroy.

The ideal of liberty has been a great source of inspiration to oppressed nationalities and depressed societies. It has destroyed many an old order in which some good aspects of life underwent change. But on the whole it has given national, political, civil and religious freedom. Great wars have been fought to uphold its banner for the creation of good life.

The fight for social equality has been a long drawn out struggle, and is still continuing. Politically it has received

Equality recognition in advanced countries. It has helped to minimise social differences between castes and classes. The ideal of equality emphasizes the similarities between men in interests, desires and ideals. They may possess dissimilarities in body and mind, their powers and potentialities but men are social and therefore they must be given equality of opportunities and treated as equals not in equipments and abilities but in social interests and ideals. They must be treated largely equal before the law in holding minimum of economic possessions and in political rights and duties as citizens. They must be allowed and helped to live a minimum standard of material life. Equality is meant to rectify the inequalities created by undue freedom of the strong or of those with hereditary privileges and means. The ideal of equality which leads backward peoples to a better life is greatly desirable. Of course in a proper arrangement of society needs of men, their abilities and their functions will have to be considered, and the standard of absolute equality will have to be modified because equal efforts and services are not possible.

Citizens should live as brothers. The chief characteristic of family life and brotherhood is service. One is to help and

Fraternity to serve the other. One is not to dominate the other. The ideal is the extension of the highest idea of family to society, of brothers to citizens. One is not lord, the other is not slave. One is for the other and should live for him. This requires the cultivation of virtues of sympathy, tolerance and respect for the feelings and activities of others. This ideal ties the social units into bonds of union.

as the ideal of equality raises the status, and that of liberty gives opportunity.

The ideal of justice is difficult to define. Some hold it to be based on law or Śruti and Smṛti dictates, some on Sadācāra (usages of the good) or Mahājana-panthā, or Antaḥkaraṇapravṛtti or Samaya of Justice and Equity. the learned, that is, the conduct, ways or tendencies of good or great or conscientious men; and others on Satya or truth, Samatva or equality, Ahimsā or tolerance, or abstract ideals as propounded by great legislators. Plato's idea of justice is that arrangement of society in which every one is placed in the position for which he is best fitted, that is, one man one function according to his traits.

But these ideas of justice are sometimes opposed or modified by the ideas of Lokācāra, Lokahita, Lokamata or Lokasthiti, that is, of people's traditions and customs, interests, opinions or order, and they have to be practised for the time being even if opposed by the highest social or political ideals.

Plato's conception largely subordinates the individual life, to the service or the demands of the state, and divorces man from other functions of life, and thus neglects his universal nature or interest.

Happiness is the ultimate aim of mankind. But in a society the realisation of the happiness of each and all is a difficulty. Therefore the utilitarians have proposed the greatest happiness of the greatest number as the ideal of society. This happiness is not what may be called the immediate happiness. It is the ultimate happiness that is aimed at. It can be attained by the sacrifice of immediate happiness and by great efforts.

The existence of propertied, privileged and power-possessing classes and their tyranny on the one hand, and that of landless, rightless and oppressed classes and their misery on the other, gave rise to conflicts and the awakening of a desire for equality, freedom, power and property. To achieve this, self-effort and independence from other's control or

tyranny became the immediate aims of the oppressed. Thus, it was thought that the ends of good life could be reached by all.

We have discussed above the ideas underlying democracy. We know that democracy is the active, social and political ideal of modern times. It means the rule of the people directly or with the consent of the people representatively and responsibly. It synthesises the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity, and tries to create a legitimate order of civil society where each has a place, opportunity and function.

It was the characteristic of some of the Greek city states, especially Athens. The result of its influence was a great body of public-spirited citizens with whom the freedom of their country, and a full share in the political power and civil rights were the chief concerns and aims. But the Greek democracy was a direct democracy that is every Greek was a member of the state and took a direct part in its affairs legislative, executive and judicial. It was confined only to Greeks and therefore it was a limited democracy. A large class of people were not recognised as citizens and had no part or place in the states of Greece e.g., Sparta was an oligarchy. It was only developed or seen at a particular stage of their political evolution though, no doubt, it was the best period of their political and cultural history.

Modern democracy is a representative or indirect democracy. In large states direct democracy was not possible. All people could not gather at one place for deliberation as in small city-states. They could only send representatives to express their wishes. The political affairs were to be carried on with the consent and deliberation of these representatives. Representation was at first confined only to the noble or the propertied, the privileged or the priests, but later on property-qualifications came to be lowered and now Universal Suffrage is admitted to be the basis of representative democracy.

There have been some attacks on the ideal of Democracy. Some state it to be the rule of the incompetent and the untrained. It is considered as opposed to liberalism, because it stereotypes opinion and will not admit what is new. There are also other charges of corruption, selfishness and ignorance against it. It is stated that there is in it no scope for leadership of specialists or the intelligent who alone can deal with the vast problems of modern complex society. To such writers democracy means death or decay, and aristocracy of talent means life and progress. Modern biologists and psychologists have emphasised the inherent differences, physical and mental, between races of mankind and between individuals of the same race. Types of men and traits of man, they say, differ, and there is no equality but superiority and inferiority amongst men. But democracy really means only equalisation of opportunities and the right of citizens to be rated according to their merits. There may be some weaknesses in its working but conditions of life are better under it than they were before. It is to be worked as a form of society and an ideal and not as a mere form of government. If the man is perfectible and increases in wisdom, then democracy is justified. The test of government is the welfare of the people, and that form of government is to be preferred which gives human tendencies the fullest and most constant stimulation, and contributes to their all-round growth.

CHAPTER VII

PATRIOTISM AND HUMANITY

PATRIA, la patrie motherland fatherland or Janmabhūmi has been the cry and the object of service and sacrifice of many a people. Love of the country or Love of the country patriotism is the enlargement or extension of a narrow group sentiment into a wider national sentiment. It does not concern itself with the differences of the people in a country but with the idolising of their common home and birth place where their material moral and spiritual wants are secured provided and developed. It becomes a sort of religion with a faith in its greatness, goodness and separateness. The country is not considered a mere territory. The particular area is merely its foundation and its limits. It is also considered a human association with a sentimental bond which rises upon this territorial foundation. It is a sentiment of love or brotherhood and a sense of fellowship which attracts and ties together all those who are born and live in it. Thus it is not a mere aggregation of human beings but an association of fellow beings working for a common end and a common harmony and aspiration. If this aspect of concord and co operation has not developed if there exist inequalities privileges and exclusive castes the country in the patriotic sense has not arisen. It is then a mere habitation and a geographical expression. In the patriotic conception the country becomes the home the members of which are more intimate and family like in feeling thought and action. It is a sort of brotherhood, believing in its distinct unity and in a separate function or mission of its own. Therefore to love or to live and die for one's country becomes the aim of a patriot. This aim has been approved by many peoples. With this love they have sought to maintain their country's independence and sought to sustain its fame and distinction.

The patriotic sentiment has helped constructively to promote the springs of good life in the hearts and minds, speeches and actions of the rich and the poor, the old and the young, the men and women of all classes in a country. It is an ennobling force which inspires and drives them to unselfish acts. It may either be expressed racially in such phrases as England for the English or India for the Indians, or religiously and politically in such words as Britannia or Hindmātā, or poetically in such songs as Bande Mātaram, La Marseilles or Deutschland uber alles, or symbolically in such flags as the Union Jack or Tricolor. This sentiment has now come to possess an immense force and acts like a spell on the politically and culturally conscious and self-respecting people. Faith in it has steadily grown and spread throughout the world. No doubt the call to patriotism to-day has come for the purpose of better material conditions, for liberty and for happiness because the people have been found poor, unfree and unhappy. But in its course it has destroyed narrow tribal or racial, caste or communal jealousies, and under its influence men have enlarged their social vision and virtues, and field of service and sacrifice, and scope of glory and martyrdom for the common good. It has extended the social and moral conception of the family, the affection of the home, the power and means of the individual in the service of the nation as a whole. It means that each one of us must live not for himself but for others who are our fellow-beings. Thus with the idea of brotherhood lying under it, it has minimised conflict and created co-operation in large areas and large groups of human beings sometimes differing even in languages and origins, and in ideas and modes of social and personal life. It has recreated life in these areas or groups, giving them the same mind and outlook, the same feeling and spirit, the same laws and institutions. It however does recognise and allow differences on many aspects of a self-sufficing national life, and does adjust into a harmonious whole one another's functions

or ways of living without breaking the fundamental unity and vision of a life of common aims and aspirations

Patriotism is not merely a racial religious cultural or lingual sentiment. It has a geographical basis and an historical background. Some peculiar geographical environment and some great historical event of joy or sorrow mould its character and give it a unity of spirit and thought aim and action which is an essential factor in the rise of the feeling and faith of patriotism. The result is that a territorial group comes to have a common sentiment confined to itself and distinct from others.

This does not necessarily mean that it is a fighting group struggling against other groups, or going against humanitarian conceptions and common human needs. Ordinarily it does not come in the way of intellectual, religious, commercial and humanitarian co operation of the world. But it has a peculiar group way of looking at things and problems and believes in its political independence or autonomy and methods and forms of government.

There is no doubt that the sentiment of patriotism can be magnified so as to become a danger to common civilisation and humanity, just as racial religious and economic sentiments have often become so under the forms of tribe church and state.

Thus the people of a country support their country's cause and standpoint in a blind way, whether it be right or wrong and fight with its might to defeat a true cause. This neglect of high principles of moral behaviour and the unjustified aggrandisement of wealth, power and lands done at the cost of others are the great evils which sometimes accompany the patriotic impulses of many European countries. Here their patriotism is too narrow. It is really a perversion of a great impulse. The fault arises from an encroachment on other rights and a false conception of one's duties. It is then not a virtue but selfishness naked and unashamed.

Patriotism and humanity are not antagonistic sentiments. For humanity is a single body of the whole mankind, and we are its members. We are men before we are citizens of a particular country. Mankind is one. It is common in its origin and possesses a similarity in its chief mental and moral characteristics, though it has evolved through its history in various ways and has reached different stages. The community of humanity is easily evident when we see the sympathies which are evoked in our minds for other human beings. A country is merely a smaller and inner circle in the greater circle of humanity. This fact we can never forget, just as we should not forget the other fact that a group, be it a minority or a majority, is not to be sacrificed in the temporary interests of an unthinking, or conservative humanity. Humanity at its best is represented even in the life of a small group which works out its best ideas and ideals. The right kind of patriotism is the best humanitarianism applied locally. It is the practical adoption of a great sentiment and virtue in a definite area. When patriotism is considered as an expression of culture it is indicated through the language and literatures of a country. If patriotism denotes a sensitiveness to the claims of other nations, it may be seen in the relations of one nation to the other.

Moreover, we know what is good for mankind through the experience arising out of the contact and conflict of smaller groups or nations. And the common good of mankind can be really realised in maintaining the special characteristics and contributions of a nation and in using them in the service of other nations. Aggrandising patriotism has to be condemned and checked. But a nation is and can become an instrument for doing service to humanity which has not as yet organised its own life independently in a unitary or federal way. A nation alone therefore gives us experience in realising what is or can be the ideal humanity itself. When we bring together the experiences of great civilised nations we know what

Patriotism is a practical conception.

the claims of humanity ought to be. But these experiences or ideals are not to be gathered from the bigoted missionary, the greedy merchant and the inhuman machine gun of a national civilisation. The highest ideals of humanity have come often from forest thinkers and city philosophers.

Man's life to day his thoughts and ideals his actions and endeavours are influenced by a common inheritance of ideas and institutions. It is also dependent on the co-operation of others and on their giving and receiving. Therefore we must not be too self-satisfied. The world has created

The necessity of human considerations

new altruistic values and emphasized different other-regarding virtues. Its social wisdom has increased. Hence even in the absence of a social or political world organisation we must not interpret our patriotism or nation-sentiment in the wrong way, but must examine and respond and receive these new values, virtues and widened wisdom coming from the great men and experience of ages of other countries and become the inheritors and promoters of the world-culture in its best and perfect form. Our old reputation in material wealth, moral strength, intellectual vigour and spiritual wisdom should not stand in our present attempts to rise higher than where we are. Otherwise in the modern world we shall be segregated, isolated, and suppressed and will become stagnant and decadent. We must study and imbibe knowledge in more centres of culture and places of learning than in our own traditional one.

The conception of patriotism involves more the conception of duties than that of rights. The duties to an immediate neighbour or nearer neighbours who are in

The conception of duty

habiting a city or a country are its primary object. Hence we owe obedience and service to these neighbourhood ideals and organisations in the interests of all. In their association and service man gets opportunities to learn and to develop. Hence his virtues and worth increase and potentialities come out. Men are similar

and social. They feel sympathy for one another in distress, common joy in success, hatred against tyranny, love for freedom, repulsion from vices, and attraction to virtues. In the best man the heart of humanity beats, and in the common man it resounds and responds. There lies a feeling of brotherhood in all, and there is an overflowing of brotherhood in the best. In any organisation of society this feeling of common humanity, and a response to its calls is dormant. It has to be awakened and used. The problems of man are the same everywhere. His ideals of order and liberty, beauty and benevolence, justice and joy, progress and perfection, truth and toleration, are similar. His struggles and sufferings for their realisation in opposition to the usurpations of the wicked and selfish men are similarly circumstanced. They evoke a genuine sympathy from everywhere in the world because they are essentially human. Differences of men are local and historical. Every patriot has to keep the civilised conceptions of human welfare in mind and run to another's help. If our neighbours are bad, we cannot improve ourselves, nor maintain our improvement. We improve along with others and the whole. The best life of man can only be developed fully by his association with all. Then his inherent and dormant powers will fully come out and express themselves. In the more intimate and numerous relations of one another men create and evolve better.

INDEX

- Abhyudaya 34, 138
 Ācāra 3 4 5 7
 Aliens position and disabilities of, 37
 Ānanda 2
 Anarchists 76
 Anthropology 24
 Antyajas 19
 Anugriha functions 74
 Āpaddharma 4
 Aristotle on State and Politics 18 31
 33 47 48 55 82 83 86 88 90
 Artha 4, 6
 Arthasāstra 3 5 6 10
 Ārka 85
 Aspects of life 136
 Āśrama 4
 Āśramas 1 12 13 35 138
 Āśrama theory 3
 Āsura, 29
 Ātmā 1
 Authoritarian ideas in politics decay
 of 97
 Autonomy to minorities and local
 groups 123 124 125
 Avasthā 1, 15

 Bande Mātaram, 146
 Bandhanas 4
 Bhāṭṭā, 6
 Bhāryā, 6
 Bhasma on Social Contract 64
 Bhasma on Government 79
 Bicameral system of Legislature 134
 Biology, its relation to Civics 26
 Brahmā 62 79
 Brahmachārī 4
 Brāhmana 4 5 7 14 19 20
 Bṛhaspati 85
 Burke on Party 117

 Cānakya, 85
 Candragupta 85
 Citizen—
 Aim of 36
 Aristotle's definition of, 33
 Disfranchised 37
 Hindu conception of 33 34
 Hindu ideas of the rights and duties
 of 59 60
 Modern European idea of 34
 Obligations of 59
 Private duties of 59
 Public duties of 59
 Rights of 58
 Voting qualifications of 58
 Citizenship 34 35
 Acquisition of 58
 Hindu idea of 35
 City state 103
 City states of Greece 81 82 143
 Civics—
 Aim of 40
 Character of the Laws of 38
 Hindu conception of 35 36 38
 Meaning of 23 37
 Place and importance of 37 38
 Place of origin of 31
 Problem of 23
 Relation to social sciences of 25—29
 Scope of 39 40
 Civilisation 23 31 32
 Collectivists 76
 Communists 76
 Communist view of government 76
 Commonwealth 51 52
 Community 50
 Conservative and radical political
 theories 88
 Constitution— 8 69 70
 Written and unwritten rigid and
 flexible 70
 Amendment of 134 135
 Country 49
 Love of 145
 Culture 32
 Current view of government 77

 Danda 62
 Dandas 1 16
 Dandanīti 5 10 79
 Daśalakṣaṇaka Dharma Manu on
 18 20
 Darvi 29
 Democracy—
 Ancient and modern 102
 Approval of 39

- Conception of, 99.
 Definition of, 95.
 Ideal of, 143, 144.
 Problems of, 129.
 Underlying idea of, 104
 Deśa, 10.
 Deśāntara, 56.
 Devolution, 134
 Dharma, 4, 6, 8, 14, 63
 Dharmāntara, 56.
 Dharmaśāstra, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10.
 Dharmasthiya functions, 74
 Dharmaśūtras, 7.
 Dhāraṇā, 5.
 Divine Right Theory, 62
 Duty, conception of, 149 150
 Duryōdha, 4.
 Dvāpara Age, 14

 Economics, its relation to Civics, 28
 Education and Civics, 27
 Elections intervals of, 121, 122
 Empire, 51
 Equality, 141
 Ethics, its relation to Civics, 27
 Eugenics—its relation to Civics 26
 Evolutionary Theory of the Nature
 and Origin of Society, 47.

 Family, 42, 51.
 Federal Government, 73.
 Federation, 52.
 Fellowfeeling, 21.
 Force Theory, 63.
 Fraternity 141.
 Functional idea, 13.
 Functions of Government, essential
 or constituent, 74.
 Optional, 74.

 Gana, 8, 9, 10.
 Ganadharma, 9.
 General will, 64.
 Golden Age, 61.
 Good Life 17, 138.
 Gorakṣa, 7.
 Government—
 Aristotle's classification of, 72.
 Definition of, 48.
 Despotic and Democratic forms of,
 72.
 Federal and Unitary, 73.
 Forms of, 72.
 Functions of, 74.
 Hindu classification of, 74, 75.
 Hindu classification of forms of, 72.
 Methods of, 75.
 Modern classification of, 72.
 Necessity of, 61.
 Parliamentary and Presidential, 72,
 73.
 Theories of the functions of, 75, 76.
 Theories of the origin of, 61—66.
 Structure of, 79
 Grāma, 8, 10.
 Greeks, on state, 55
 Grhastha, 4.
 Grhya Sūtras, 8.
 Guna, 3.
 Gunas 1, 16.
 Gunadharma, 4

 Happiness, 142.
 Hare's scheme, 113
 Objections to, 113
 Hegel, 55
 Hindmātā, 146
 Hindu Civilisation, aim of, 23
 Hindu Civilisation, underlying
 principle of, 2
 Hindu Political system, 11.
 Hindu Śāstras—
 Aim of, 6.
 Contents of, 4.
 Mutual relations, 6.
 Treatises of, 7, 8.
 Hindu Social Organisation, character
 of, 2.
 Hindu Social Theory—
 Aims and ideas of, 1.
 Contents of, 1.
 King's position and the territorial
 and functional groups in, 8—13.
 Nature of, 13.
 Object of, 3.
 Its Relation to Vedānta, 13.
 Historical Theory of Government, 65.
 History, its relation to Civics, 25.
 Hobbes on Pre-social Life, 21, 41, 46.
 .. on ruler, 63.
 .. on Social Contract, 64.
 Humanity, 50, 149.

 Ideals, Social and Political, 138, 140.
 Idiocy, 24.
 Indian political aspirations, 95—97.
 Individualists, 107.
 Individualist view of Government, 76,
 77.
 Indo-Aryan forms of life, their
 importance, 17.

- Industrial Revolution 76
 Initiative 127, 128
 Interest of all 119
 Internal check, 94
 International relations 71
- Jinapada 8
 Janmabhumi 145
 Jati 8 9 10
 Jurisprudence its relations to Civica 28
 Justice and equity 142
- Kāla 7
 Kālī Age 14
 Kālidāsa 75
 Kāma 4 6
 Kāmasūtra 3 6
 Kāntakafodhana functions 74
 Karma 1 3 14 15
 Kauṣilya on Social Contract 64
 on Law 67
 on Government 75
 on Material Life 136
 Kāyadāṇḍa 16
 King 8 9 10 11 12
 Kṛti 7
 Kṛti Age 14
 Kṛtavya 4 5 7 19
 Kṛma functions 74
 Kula 8 9 10
 Kuladharmā 9
 Kusīda 7
- Laissez faire 76
 Law, 67
 and rules 100
 Laya 15
 League of Nations 71
 Leviathan 56
 Lewis 94
 Liberty—, 140
 Civil 68
 Political 69
 National 69
 Religious 69
 Lincoln on Democracy 95
 Locke on Social Contract 64
 Logic, 87
 Lokas 1, 14 15
 Lokācāra, 142
 Lokamata 142
 Lokasthiti, 142
 Lokayātra, 38
- Mahabhārata on Government 61 62, 79
 Mahajanapatha 142
 Maine on Democracy 98
 Majority rule 123
 Man—
 Aims of 41
 As he is 40 41
 Christian idea of 41
 Competency of 107
 Environment of 29
 Forces controlling the life of 89
 Hobbes idea of 41
 Incompetency of 108 109
 Limitations of 41
 Nature of 29
 Rousseau's idea of 30 41
 Social nature of 21
 Social position of 56 57
 Social unit 55 56
 Society and 18 30 31
 Sounder view of 109 110
 Manodāṇḍa 16
 Manu on Social Life 18
 Manu on Government 61 62
 Mātitha Rājya 119
 Material life 136 137
 Matsyanyaya 61
 Members qualifications of 120
 Mill on Voters 115
 Mokṣa 3 4
 Mokṣasānta 3 4
 Moral life 137
 Mukti 2
 Mumukṣu 2
- Nation 48 49
 Nationality 49
 Nation state 103
 Nigraha functions 74
 Nihśreyas 4 34 138
 Nityatva 4 39
 Nivṛta 138
 Nivṛta mārga 3
 Niyamas 18 19 20
- Order 139
 Organic theory of the nature of society 45
- Panca manendriyas 6
 Pañca karmendriyas 6
 Pañca śila 19
 Pañca yāma 18
 Parahita 138

- Parārtha, 40, 59, 138.
 Paramārtha, 40, 60.
 Parliamentary form of government, 72
 Party system and the representative, 116, 117, 118.
 Patriotism and good life, 146
 Geographical and historical basis of, 147.
 Patriotism and Humanity, 148
 a practical conception, 148
 People, 50
 Plato, 31, 82, 86, 88, 142
 Plebeiate, 128.
 Political consciousness—
 Rise of, 85.
 Political Parties—
 and Public opinion, 128, 129
 Functions of, 130
 Necessity of organisation of, 131
 132
 Political Science and Theory—
 Aristotle's idea of, 90
 Definition of, 86
 Green's ideas of, 91
 Relation to Ethics, 89, 90
 Relation to History, 91, 92
 Sidgwick's ideas of, 91
 Scope of, 87.
 Political theory and political practice, 87, 88
 Politics—
 Conquered nation and, 80.
 Decay of authoritarian ideas in, 97.
 European History and, 83, 84.
 India and, 84, 85.
 Plato's and Aristotle's, 82, 83.
 Primitive society and, 85.
 Relation to Civics of, 28.
 Religion subordinated to, 98.
 Rise in Greek city-states of, 81, 82.
 Rise of, 79.
 Prakṛti, 1.
 Pratyaṅga Anubhava, 2.
 Pravṛtti, 138.
 Pravṛttimārga, 3.
 Prāyaścitta, 3, 4, 5.
 Presidential form of Government, 73
 Preyas, 34.
 Progress, 139.
 Pūṣa, 8, 9, 10.
 Pūṣadharmā, 9.
 Punarjanma, 1, 14, 15.
 Pura, 8, 10.
 Puruṣa, 1.
 Puruṣārtha, 1, 13, 35, 138
 Puruṣārtha theory, 3.
 Psychology, its relation to Civics, 27
 Rājadharmā, 10
 Rājās, 29
 Rājāsika, 16.
 Rāmāyana on Government, 61
 Rāstra, 8, 10
 Recall, 128
 Race, 50
 Referendum, 125
 Defects of, 126, 127
 Merits of, 125
 Obligatory, 126
 Optional, 126
 Religion, its relation to Civics, 29.
 Representation—
 its principle, 105
 of individuals and groups, 114
 of minorities, 111, 112
 Ten questions of, 106
 Three methods of, 112—114.
 Representative, a delegate or a trustee, 116
 Representative Government, 123, 124.
 Ruler, his relation to law and legislator in India, 109
 Rousseau on Man and Society, 30, 41.
 .. on Social Contract, 64
 Sadācāra, 8, 10, 142
 Sāmāntika Dharma, 18, 20.
 Samaya, 142.
 Samāntāra, 3.
 Samavāyas, 8.
 Samyama, 8.
 Sāmānyadharmā, 4.
 Saṁśloka, 12.
 Sanyāsa, 138.
 Sanyāsī, 4, 20.
 Śānti, 2
 Saptaṅga, 52
 Satva, 29
 Sattvika, 16
 Satya-yuga, 61.
 Seely, 91
 Separation of Powers—
 Montesquieu's theory of, 133.
 Smith, 10.
 Social contract theory of Government, 64
 Social contract theory of the origin of society, 46.
 Social Life—
 Manu's ideas of, 18.
 Virtues necessary for, 19, 20.
 Social Philosophy, 25.
 Social Science, 23, 24, 25.

- Social Sciences their relation to Tapas 4 7
 Civics 23—29
 Socialists 107
 Socialist view of Government 76.
 Society—
 and Organism, 44
 Character of primitive societies, 43
 Character of modern societies 43
 44
 Definition of 50
 Growth of 42
 Theories of the nature and origin
 of society 45—47
 Sociology, 24
 Sovereign power scope of 66
 Sovereignty, its meaning 53
 its checks 94
 of the people 101
 Political 94
 Spiritual life 137 138
 Śrauta sūtras 7
 Śreni 8 9 10
 Śreni dharma 9
 Śreyas 34
 Śruti 10
 State—
 a means or an end 55
 Definition of 47 48
 Elements of 52 53, 92 93
 Historical forms of, 103
 Nature of 54
 Relation of state to the individual
 and the group, 78
 Śihū 15
 Śūdra 4, 7, 19
 Śukrārya 85
 Svabhāva 1 2 3
 Svabhāvadharma, 4
 Svadhyāya, 4
 Svātha 40, 59
 Tamas, 29
 Tāmasika 16
 Tattva 2
 Treitschke 64
 Tretā Age 14
 Trigunāmaka 41
 Tvarga 6
 Udāracanta 138
 Unitary government 73
 Universal Empire State 103
 Universal Suffrage 107
 Utpatti 15
 Varna 4
 Varnas 1 13 35 138
 Varna theory 3
 Varnāśrama 140
 Vaisakikas 4
 Vaisya 4 5 6 7 19
 Vākdanḍa 16
 Vānaprastha 4
 Vasiṣṭya 7
 Vartā 5 10
 Vedābhyaśa 7
 Vedānta 13
 Vedas 7
 Vidyā 7
 Vidyāpithas 12
 Viṣṇu 62
 Voters qualifications of 114 115
 Voting 110 111
 proportional 113
 patty 114
 Vrata 4 7
 Vṛtti 5
 Vyavahāra 3 4 5 7 9
 Yajña, 4, 7
 Yajnadharma 7
 Yamas 18 19 20
 Yoga 138
 Yoga functions 74
 Yugas, 1 14